NEW COLLEGE
LIBRARY
EDINBURGH

WITHD
C7/62

p. 20 Codex Vaticanus
p. 25 ~ Bezae (D)

JON BALSERAK
Univ. of Birmingham
07867 538 758 (mobile)
0121 415 2276 (work)

WITHDRAWN

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

https://archive.org/details/textcanonofnewte0000alex_s1h9

THE TEXT AND CANON
OF THE
NEW TESTAMENT

STUDIES IN THEOLOGY

Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel.
By THEODORE H. ROBINSON, D.D. (Lond.).

Some Living Religions of the East.
By SIDNEY CAVE, D.D.

Christianity and Ethics.
By ARCHIBALD B. D. ALEXANDER, M.A., D.D.

The Environment of Early Christianity.
By S. ANGUS, M.A., Ph.D.

A History of the Study of Theology. Vol. I. and Vol. II.
By Dr. C. A. BRIGGS.

The Christian Hope.
By W. ADAMS BROWN, Ph.D., D.D.

Christianity and Social Questions.
By WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM, F.B.A., D.D., D.Sc.

The Justification of God.
By Rev. P. T. FORSYTH.

Christian Apologetics.
By Rev. A. E. GARVIE.

A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament.
By GEORGE BUCHANAN GRAY, D.D., D.Litt.

Gospel Origins.
By WILLIAM WEST HOLDSWORTH, M.A.

Faith and its Psychology.
By WILLIAM R. INGE, D.D.

The Theology of the Epistles.
By H. A. A. KENNEDY, D.D.

The Originality of the Christian Message.
By H. R. MACKINTOSH.

Christianity and Sin.
By ROBERT MACKINTOSH, D.D.

Protestant Thought before Kant.
By A. C. McGIFFERT, Ph.D., D.D.

The Theology of the Gospels.
By JAMES MOFFATT, D.D., D.Litt.

A History of Christian Thought since Kant.
By EDWARD CALDWELL MOORE, D.D.

The Doctrine of the Atonement.
By J. K. MOZLEY, M.A.

Revelation and Inspiration.
By JAMES ORR, D.D.

A Critical Introduction to the New Testament.
By ARTHUR SAMUEL PEAKE, D.D.

Philosophy and Religion.
By HASTINGS RASHDALL, D.Litt. (Oxon.), D.C.L. (Durham).

The Holy Spirit.
By T. REES, M.A. (Lond.), B.A. (Oxon.).

The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament.
By H. WHEELER ROBINSON, M.A.

The Text and Canon of the New Testament.
By ALEXANDER SOUTER, D.Litt.

Christian Thought to the Reformation.
By HERBERT B. WORKMAN, D.Litt.

The Pharisees and Jesus.
By A. T. ROBERTSON.

THE TEXT AND CANON

OF THE

NEW TESTAMENT

BY

ALEXANDER SOUTER

SOMETIME YATES PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK AND EXEGESIS IN MANSFIELD COLLEGE, OXFORD

WITHDRAWN

DUCKWORTH

3 HENRIETTA STREET, LONDON, W.C.

BIBLIOTHECA COLL. NOV. EDINENSIS

First Published . . *1912*
Second Impression . . *1925*
Third Impression . . *1930*

All rights reserved

Printed in Great Britain by T. and A. CONSTABLE LTD.
at the University Press, Edinburgh.

ELIZABETH

CONIVGI DILECTISSIMAE

IN COMMEMORATIONEM

ANNORVM XIII

1899-1912

PREFACE

THE chief justification for the appearance of the present work is that a series of the comprehensiveness of 'Studies in Theology' would not be complete without some treatment of the Text and Canon of the New Testament. There is a further reason in the fact that the progress made in these subjects is such, that every ten years or so, a brief treatment of them, an attempt to gather together the results of multitudinous books and articles, is a necessity, if any beyond the narrow circle of experts are to be put in possession of the new facts. The writer gained some knowledge of these facts during the eight years in which it was his privilege to teach those subjects in Mansfield College, Oxford. The preparation, also, of an up-to-date critical apparatus to the New Testament, which has been published by the Clarendon Press in conjunction with the 'Revisers' Text' (November 1910, and later), gave him some acquaintance with the materials of New Testament textual criticism. The first part of the present book is intended not merely to present as briefly as possible what students ought to know, but also to act as an encouragement to them to take up some branch of the textual criticism of the New Testament. For this reason some repetition in the course of the work may be excused. I would fain allure some Churchmen from the fascinating pursuit of liturgiology, and some Nonconformists from the equally if not more fascinating pursuit of speculative

theology, to the study, say, of the abundant manuscript materials which exist for the writing of the history of the Latin Bible. Why, for instance, should we still lack a scientific edition of the biblical commentaries of our countryman, the Venerable Bede? The materials exist in abundance and are of superlative quality.

Some critics may find the part of the book on the Canon too brief. Here I have preferred to let the documents speak for themselves, and have presented them in greater number and more accurate text than the English reader will be able to find them elsewhere in a volume of this compass. That I am able to do so is partly due to the kindness of Mr. C. H. Turner and the Delegates of the Clarendon Press, who have kindly authorised the republication of certain documents from the *Journal of Theological Studies*. For the general study of the Canon I am mostly beholden to the second edition of Theodor von Zahn's *Grundriss der Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*. It is a continual surprise to me that this work has not yet been translated into English: we have nothing to compare with it. Other obligations incurred in both parts of the book are acknowledged in their places.

This book was more than half written before I was called away from Oxford to other work. I hope it may be in some sense regarded as a legacy to my former students there.

May Cottage, Torphins,
Aberdeenshire, *July* 7, 1912.

Postscript.—The 'Damasine' Council of 382 must now disappear from history, thanks to the epoch-making results of Professor E. von Dobschütz of Breslau (see notes to Documents G and S).

CONTENTS

THE TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	Ancient Texts and their Transmission	3
II.	Sources of the New Testament Text	10
III.	Greek Manuscripts	19
IV.	The Older Versions: Latin and Syriac	33
V.	The Older Versions (Egyptian [Coptic] Versions, Gothic)	64
VI.	Secondary Versions	71
VII.	Patristic (and other early) Citations	76
VIII.	Printed Editions of the Greek New Testament and Versions	94
IX.	Principles of Criticism, etc.	111
X.	The Future Outlook	138

THE CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

I.	Preliminary: the Idea and the Word	149
II.	Earliest Collections of New Testament Books	160
III.	The Earliest Period for Extensive Quotation (170-220): the Earliest Versions	169
IV.	Books of Temporary and Local Canonicity	178
V.	From Origen to Chrysostom in the East	182

CHAP. PAGE

VI. From 250 to 450 in the West 189

VII. Conciliar Deliverances 195

VIII. The Reformation and Later 198

Selected Documents 205

Selected Bibliography 238

Index 249

THE TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

CHAPTER I

ANCIENT TEXTS AND THEIR TRANSMISSION

§ 1. Textual Criticism

Textual criticism seeks, by the exercise of knowledge and trained judgment, to restore the very words of some original document which has perished, and survives only in copies complete or incomplete, accurate or inaccurate, ancient or modern. If we possessed the twenty-seven documents now composing our New Testament exactly in the form in which they were dictated or written by their original authors, there would be no textual criticism of the New Testament. The original documents, however, have long perished, and we have to make the best of the copies which have survived, by howsoever many removes they may be distant from their ultimate originals. Every fresh copy introduces fresh possibilities of error. We have only to try to copy anything ourselves to see how liable to error we are. Some persons are absolutely unable to copy a document with even reasonable accuracy, and the most careful copyists will discover errors made by them if they compare their copy afresh with the original. The same liability to error occurs in the reprinting of printed texts. For example, the earliest printed edition of the commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul, published under the name of Primasius at Lyons in 1537, was reprinted at Cologne in 1538, and at Paris in 1543, and from this latter edition a reprint was made, which in its turn was the origin of the copy published in Migne's Latin Patrology in the middle of last century. In all this long interval conscious alteration there was practically none, yet the Migne edition,

accurate as it is considered, is wrong in scores of places where the earliest edition is right.

If such things are possible in the case of printed texts seldom reprinted, the possibilities of error are greatly increased where manuscripts are concerned, because sometimes the copyist found difficulties with his predecessor's handwriting, or was unable to expand correctly contractions used by him. As a rule, the old copyists did their best to make an accurate copy of what they saw before them, and it is in so far as they did this that their work has real value. If, in addition to using their eyes, they used their brains, and altered what seemed to them the errors of their predecessors into what they thought these predecessors ought to have written, they introduce confusion into the tradition and add to the difficulties of the modern textual critic. As a matter of fact, they rarely restore the real text, even where they hit the right sense. On the whole, it may be said that this vice of 'correcting' is rare in the period to which the earliest surviving MSS. belong, and increasingly common from about the eleventh century. From these remarks it will be seen that the task of sane textual criticism is no light one. The critic must possess, in addition to a knowledge of the language in which the manuscripts are written, a familiarity with the external characteristics of manuscripts in all periods, their size, the material on which they are written, the arrangement of columns, pages, and so forth, with the history of handwriting in all its forms, with punctuation, contractions, and such like matters: in other words, he must be a palæographer, or acquainted with the results attained by palæographers. The extraordinarily extended use of photography in relation to manuscripts has made it possible not only to obtain splendid photographs of single pages, but even to reproduce whole manuscripts in photographic facsimile, either in the size of the originals, or in a reduced size. Such reproductions for many purposes may take the place of the originals. The textual critic must not, however, be content even with this knowledge, which will tell him what errors

might occur : he must also possess a thorough acquaintance with errors which actually *have* occurred,[1] and this it is not easy to acquire in any other way than by first-hand acquaintance with manuscripts. The principles of textual criticism will meet us later.

§ 2. Material of Books and Styles of Writing

Roughly speaking, we may divide the history of manuscripts, as far as the New Testament student is concerned with them, into three periods : a papyrus period, lasting to the seventh century ; a vellum or parchment period, stretching from the end of the third to the fifteenth century ; and a paper period, beginning about the fourteenth century. The period of uncial writing, that is, of rounded capitals, lasts down to the tenth century, but already about the end of the eighth the old cursive hand, refined into a book hand, began the reign of minuscules. We speak of manuscripts older than the end of the tenth century as old ; those of the eleventh and twelfth centuries are of the middle period ; others are late. Two causes tended to the change from papyrus to vellum. The first was the decrease in the supply of the former material, but the second and more potent cause was the greater usefulness and durability of vellum. While papyrus generally bore writing only on one side, and being commonly in roll form was both inconvenient to consult and could contain only one of any of the longer New Testament books, vellum could bear writing on both sides, was in sheets, and therefore capable of being bound up as a modern book, and could contain the whole New Testament if necessary. An increase in the cost of vellum gave the impetus to the sale of paper, a product of the East, in the century or two preceding the inventing of printing, which took place about 1450.

With the possible exception of such tiny writings as the

[1] A model enumeration of examples from the Latin classical writers is in Prof. A. E. Housman's *M. Manilii Astronomicon Liber Primus* (London, 1903), pp. liv-lix.

Epistle to Philemon, and the Second and Third Epistles of St. John, which may have been written on waxed tablets with an iron pen or *stilus*, all the writings of the New Testament must have been written in the first instance on papyrus, with reed-pen (*calamus*) and ink, and it is of some interest and importance to realise their external appearance and character. This has become possible through the extensive discovery of papyrus rolls at Herculaneum in Italy in the eighteenth century, and particularly in Egypt in the nineteenth century. The nature of papyrus being such that a damp climate reduces it to pulp, the vast quantity of papyrus which must have existed in other countries of the Roman world has all perished, and it is to the action of Vesuvius on the one hand, and the dry climate of Egypt on the other, that we are indebted for the papyrus rolls that survive. The visitor to museums will note that the Herculanean papyrus fragments are generally charred, while those from Egypt are brittle, but when the papyrus was new it was soft and flexible.

The papyrus plant grew in abundance in Egypt in ancient times, and its use as writing material was familiar at least three thousand years before Christ. The inner bark of the shrub was cut longitudinally into thin strips which were laid side by side. These were crossed by other strips. The combined strips were pressed hard together, and the whole was then dried in the sun. The edges were then made smooth by pumice-stone, probably after the sheet had been rolled up, separate portions having been glued together with the aid of Nile water, regarded as specially suitable for the purpose, until the desired length was attained. Papyrus was sold in the stationers' shops from six to eighteen inches in height, at so much a length, just as paper is sold by the quire to-day, and the unused part could be clipped off, or extra parts added as desired. The writing was in the first instance on the side where the fibres were horizontal, for the obvious reason that it was easier to write on that side. The custom was to write in very narrow columns, without separation of words, without

accents, or breathings, and almost entirely without punctuation; these columns were sometimes numbered. In carefully written manuscripts a new paragraph was shown by a gap in the text, and a short horizontal line in the margin opposite, which line written at the side (*para*, *graphein*) is the origin of the English word paragraph. The title of a book was either added at the end of the roll, or on a little slip containing it gummed to the top edge, or it was given in both places.[1] The roll was held in the hands in such a way that the left hand rolled up what had been read, while the right hand unrolled what was still to be read. A core of papyrus or another stick was used round which it was rolled and thus kept smooth. For practical convenience a roll had not to exceed a certain length, and we can see that St. Luke, who wrote the two longest books in the New Testament, crushed the utmost amount he could into both rolls, being doubtless possessed of much more material on the life and sayings of Jesus and the apostles than he was actually able to use in his Gospel and Acts. Rolls when not in use were commonly kept in cylindrical cases with a lid on the top, and no doubt the four rolls containing the four Gospels would commonly be contained in one such box in the earlier days of the Church.

The narrow columns familiar to the reader of papyrus books were retained in the oldest vellum MSS., and as the leaves were generally square, each page could hold more than one such column, the number being determined by the size of the page. The number of columns per page probably never exceeded four, and two became very fashionable. In other respects, also, the customs of the papyri were retained. There was, in fact, no proper separation of words, and no fully developed use of accents and breathings before the ninth century, at which period the uncial writing was dying; so that we may almost say that these facilities for reading were unknown till the days

[1] Hardly any of the slips have survived. An instance of the title at the foot of the final column is Ξενοφῶντος Κύρου Παιδείᾳ—α (*Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part iv., No. 698: London, 1904).

of minuscule writing. Sheets of vellum, prepared from the skin of the sheep, antelope, and other animals, were so arranged that hair side was put next hair side and flesh side next flesh side. The number of such, folded together to form a sheet in the technical sense, varied considerably in the Greek world—four, five, and six, for example, being found, thus making eight, ten, and twelve leaves, or sixteen, twenty, and twenty-four pages respectively. In the Latin world the arrangement of four sheets laid one above the other and folded across the middle to form eight leaves or sixteen pages, and called a *quaternio* (hence, English 'quire'), is so regular, that exceptions can nearly always be explained as due either to some accident, or to the fact that a quaternion was insufficient, or more than sufficient, to contain the portion of writing desired. These sheets were commonly numbered, and served out one by one to the scribe: leaves were not commonly numbered till a very late period, say the fifteenth century, and pages were not numbered till the sixteenth—in fact, till the age of printed books was well begun. It is obvious that this custom of numbering the sheets is very convenient for the modern investigator, as it enables him to calculate the number of leaves lost in a MS., and thus to estimate what amount of text is lacking; or, contrariwise, if he knows the length of the text, he can calculate how much space the missing part would require. The number of lines per page in a carefully written MS. remains constant, and care was taken, by means of a vertical row of prickings and the use of a hard point for the drawing of lines, to keep them straight and of equal length. Books were not always bound, but when this was done, wooden boards were employed. As time goes on, the use of contractions in writing becomes in general more and more complicated, and a work in consequence takes up less and less space. In earlier days a complete vellum Bible in one volume is an excessive rarity, but in the thirteenth century thousands of them were produced in single volumes of comparatively small bulk.

The paper manuscripts vary in nothing but material from the later vellum manuscripts, and we need not dwell on them, as they are of little consequence for our purpose. The transition from them to printed books was an easy one, and it is sometimes a little difficult to tell at first sight whether a book is a late MS. or an *incunabulum*.

Scribes (*librarii*, *antiquarii*), at least in the West, were a professional class down to the sixth century A.D., till which time Rome remained the centre of the book trade. From that time manuscripts were commonly produced in monasteries throughout Western Europe, especially in those of the Benedictine Order, which have practically preserved all we have got of Latin literature, both Christian and non-Christian. Among the more beautiful products of the ancient *scriptoria* the purple MSS. deserve mention. The vellum was first stained with purple, and on this purple-stained surface the letters were penned in silver and sometimes in gold. Of these ancient *éditions de luxe* we possess several Gospel MSS. both in Greek and Latin, all, or nearly all, of which were written in the sixth century, the Greek ones probably in Constantinople, the Latin in North Italy.

CHAPTER II

SOURCES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT TEXT

FOR the reconstruction of the New Testament text in Greek, three kinds of sources are available. The first is actual manuscripts written in Greek, professing to give the words of the sacred text as written by the authors. The second is translations made from this original Greek, especially if directly made from it, and not through the medium of another language, which is itself a direct translation from the original Greek. If such a translation was carefully made, and has survived in the precise form and text in which the translator himself issued it, what we possess in it is tantamount to the Greek copy in front of the translator when he made his translation. We must always allow, of course, for the fact that we cannot always say for certain which of two Greek synonyms was before the translator, or which was the order of words in the Greek text used by him, where two or more slight differences in order are known to have existed in Greek MSS.; in general, we must allow for differences of idiom in the two languages and for the effects they produce. The third class of evidence is that of quotations made from the New Testament by other writers. Here, again, if a quotation is copied by a Greek writer exactly from a Greek New Testament in front of him, and this quotation has come down to us in the exact form in which the writer saw it, we have, with regard to the verse or verses quoted, substantially the very copy which he used. Similarly, if it was a Latin or a Syriac writer, we have got practically that portion of the Latin or Syriac sacred text which lay before the

particular writer, and we can treat it as we do the translations just mentioned.

Greek Manuscripts

In the previous chapter some account has been given of the external characteristics of manuscripts. At this point we may fitly introduce some further details about them, deferring a minute description of particular Greek MSS. to our next chapter.

A person or Church in possession of a New Testament, say in the period 250 to 300 A.D., would not have it complete in one volume. The first and most important volume would be ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ, 'the Gospel,' for the singular was regularly used of the fourfold Gospel, and it was not till about a hundred years later that people began to speak of each Gospel separately as a Gospel, and to use the plural of the four. As to the order of the Gospels in this vellum *codex*, Matthew would certainly come first, and certainly, from about 350 onwards, and probably earlier also, the order of the others would be that to which we are accustomed; the position of Matthew as the most important, and in the view of the Church the earliest, of the Gospels, was early secure. Each Gospel would be entitled merely ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ, etc. Certain, also, if not all, copies would be provided with a preface to each Gospel giving an account of the author, and also with a set of chapter headings, with divisions longer than our modern verses, corresponding to those chapter headings marked in the margin of the text. In the fourth century Eusebius made a set of tables, the use of which became widespread, by which one could ascertain at a glance in how many Gospels a particular section occurred, an early help to the study of the relation between the Gospels. The margins of such MSS. contain numbers (for which, of course, the Greeks used the letters of their alphabet) which correspond to the numbers, etc., in the preliminary tables.[1]

[1] Cf. Nestle, *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, xix. (1908), pp. 107 ff.

The second volume of our early New Testament would be entitled ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΣ, for Paul became early known as 'the Apostle' *par excellence*, and such a copy would contain, being Greek, the Epistle to the Hebrews. The order of the Epistles would be slightly different from that to which we are accustomed, the Epistle to the Hebrews coming in after Second Thessalonians, so that all the Epistles addressed to churches might be together, Hebrews coming last as one on which doubts had been cast, or from anti-Jewish prejudice. Such would be the normal arrangement in Catholic circles, but we have information about a much earlier 'Apostolos,' which deserves to be mentioned. The heretic Marcion prepared an edition of the Epistles of Paul in Greek about the middle of the second century at Rome. The Epistles were in the following order: Galatians, First and Second Corinthians, Romans, First and Second Thessalonians, Laodiceans (the name he gave to our 'Ephesians'), Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon. The text also was altered considerably to suit Marcion's special views. He also composed a set of prologues to these Epistles, as well as chapter headings and sections, which, though they have perished in the original Greek, are all extant in an early Latin translation, the use of which became practically universal in the Western Church. Another editor of the Epistles of St. Paul, Euthalius, lived at a much later period.

The third volume would contain Acts, either taken as plural (ΠΡΑϾΕΙΣ) or as singular (ΠΡΑϾΙΣ), and along with it the Catholic Epistles.

As fourth volume, if there were one at all, we should have the Apocalypse.

The contents of our existing MSS. enable us to argue safely as to the practice of the early centuries of the Church. The great majority of those still surviving are not MSS. of the whole New Testament, but MSS. of portions as distinguished above. Most of them, too, are provided with such prefatory matter as has been indicated, often also with notes for liturgical use, calendars, lists of saints

reverenced in particular districts, and so on. Occasionally, also, they bear the dates when they were written and the names of the scribes who wrote them. The total number of existing manuscripts containing all or part of the Greek New Testament, so far as known to experts, is about two thousand five hundred. A subsidiary class of Greek manuscripts is that of lectionaries or service books, some of respectable age, which contain extracts from the New Testament. As yet they have been only in part examined, and it is doubtful if they will repay detailed examination : between one and two thousand are known to exist.

Ancient Versions

The use of translations of the New Testament books became necessary as soon as there were Churches outside the bounds of the Roman Empire, or actually within it, to which Greek was an unknown language. The period of such translations begins probably about the middle of the second century. If we could obtain an autograph copy of one of these early translations it would be a prize indeed. But just as we have lost the original autographs of the Greek New Testament books, so in the case of the versions we have to depend on various copies, and here, too, critical reconstruction is required. When, too, as was undoubtedly sometimes the case, there were added to the errors of transcription the attempts of revisers to polish or correct the original translation in details, or to make a thorough revision of it with the Greek original as known to the reviser rather than as known to the first translator, obviously confusion would enter in, and the scholar who desires to recover the Greek text used by the original translator will have a task of almost insuperable difficulty. These translators did not make their translations in order that we might recover the Greek behind them, but to be useful to the Christians who could not speak or read Greek. They are rather rough and ready as a rule in their character, and one may doubt if the translators were always quite

competent for their task. But the toil of examining the MSS. now surviving, and reconstructing their text, is worth while, if we only reach a somewhat imperfect knowledge of one Greek copy which a translator had before him at a date earlier than the earliest surviving Greek manuscript. In general it may be said that translations are not of so much use for delicate textual work as they are in cases of omissions or additions, especially if they be considerable in size, and otherwise attested also.

Translations sometimes form part of bilingual codices. It is difficult from our surviving examples to say how widespread the use of such bilinguals was. Some scholars think that the earliest Latin MSS. were always bilingual, that is, manuscripts in which both the original Greek and the Latin were provided either in parallel columns or on opposite pages. Examples, some of them fragmentary, exist in the case of the following bilinguals: Greek and Latin, Greek and Sahidic, Latin and Gothic, Bohairic and Arabic, Arabic and Latin. It is easy to understand how historical conditions, whether in church or home, would make such manuscripts useful.

Guides to the sense were provided by sense-lines, the arrangement of the text in clauses or parts of clauses, each representing a thought more or less complete in itself. This, of course, would be particularly useful for reading aloud to a congregation, and, though the practice arose in the case of Greek copies, it is more characteristic of Latin.

The order of books was not always the same in translations as in surviving Greek copies. While in the Bohairic version, for instance, the order of the Gospels and Epistles of Paul was that of Greek copies, manuscripts of the Old-Latin Gospels generally had them in the order Matthew, John, Luke, Mark; and the Epistles to the Thessalonians were in very many Latin copies placed immediately after Philippians, while Hebrews was wanting. The *raison d'être* in the first case would be to keep the two apostles together, and leave the shortest Gospel to the last; and

in the second case to keep the Epistles to Macedonian churches together. In the older Latin copies, as in the Greek, the Gospel was a volume by itself, and the other parts of the New Testament were probably constituted in the same way as in the East, with the exception that the Apocalypse would be regularly present in a collection of Biblical volumes.

Patristic Citations

The third source of evidence for the New Testament text is in some ways the most interesting of all. For, if our oldest surviving bit of New Testament MS. is not earlier than 250 A.D.,[1] and our oldest translation of any part about a century earlier than that, the New Testament books began to be quoted in other writings before the close of the first century, and a first-century copy of a New Testament book is within easy reach of the original autograph. These very early quotations are, however, seldom made *diserte*—that is, explicitly from the New Testament book concerned, and accurate quotation was not generally aimed at in ancient times. Also, these quotations are very few in number and tell us little. It is not, in fact, till towards the end of the second century that the great volume of Biblical quotation really begins. From that time onwards there is a constant stream, and the older the writer the more likely he is to provide us with evidence as to valuable copies of New Testament books which have no longer survived. Let us briefly consider the importance of this class of evidence, and at the same time point out the care with which it must be used.

The history of the New Testament text is only a part of Church history, and Church history is only a part of the history of the world; and just as Church history cannot be thoroughly understood without a knowledge of general history—and not the least part of the value of Harnack's work consists in his never-failing recognition of this fact.—so

[1] See the next chapter.

the history of the New Testament text cannot be understood without a knowledge of the history of the Church. This is true, of course, of the history of dogmatic movements, and so on, but what we are here concerned with is especially the history of the lives and writings of individual Christian teachers. We know exactly where and when these writers wrote, and thus by a study of their quotations we can say that in such and such a place at such and such a time a copy, say, of the Gospels of a certain character was to be found. There will, no doubt, be many gaps in our evidence, both because not every Church contained an author, and not every author's work has survived by any means, but we shall still have in our hands a foundation of evidence on which alone anything like a history of the New Testament text can be built, and into which any fresh bit of evidence which turns up will have to be fitted. The value, then, of patristic evidence is that it is early, dated, and localised, whereas the great bulk of our Greek manuscripts and most of our versions bear no precise date or place of their origin. But there are certain drawbacks in this class of evidence as a whole.

The majority of Fathers quote only small portions of a book, and we can only tell the character of their MS. for that part, whereas Greek MSS. and versions are generally relatively complete. There is one class, however, which has not hitherto received adequate attention—that is, the class of patristic commentators who generally quote in clauses or sections the whole book on which they are commenting. Sometimes we can substantially reconstruct the MS. they used.

There is, second, the prevalent practice of quotation from memory, which makes it quite impossible in many cases to regard the words quoted as an accurate quotation from a copy of a biblical MS. in front of the writer. A close study of a writer's comments will, however, often tell us which of two competing readings he must have had.

The third and most serious qualification is, that even

where the quotation was accurately made, we cannot be sure that it is preserved exactly as the Father made it. The texts of Fathers themselves also depend on manuscripts. Here also the original autographs are lost, and here, too, we must reconstruct the text of the Father, quotations and all, by critical methods. Especially in the case of much read books, the scribes who copied out the writings of great Fathers were apt at times to harmonise their biblical quotations with the form they had in the Bibles with which they themselves were familiar : [1] sometimes, when they have got weary of doing this, they finally give it up, and we can detect by critical methods the procedure to which down to that point they have been subjecting the text. Early editors of printed editions have probably committed the same fault also, both of course with motives worthy enough in themselves. No edition of a patristic work is really valuable for the textual criticism of the New Testament which has not itself been the product of strict scientific method.

A final qualification, allied to the last, is one with regard to ancient translations of patristic works. For example, but for the zeal of the Western Church in the golden age of patristic literature we should have irretrievably lost many of the works of Origen. But it would be a mistake to treat the quotations in such Latin translations of Origen's works as exact translations of the Greek biblical quotations as they were made by Origen himself. The translations are sometimes not only loose in their representation of Origenian matter, but often provide the quotations in a form suited to the Latin Bible used by the translator a hundred and fifty years after the original composition of the work by Origen.[2] Translations, then, except where criticism leaves one free to break this rule, can only be used as evidence for the biblical text of the

[1] See, for example, *Journal of Theological Studies*, xi. (1909-10), 143-4.
[2] See, for instance, Westcott's article 'Origen' in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*; Engelbrecht's introduction to his edition of Rufinus' translation of Gregory of Nazianzus' *Sermons* (Vienna, 1910).

date, the locality, and the language into which the translation has been made.[1]

In our later chapters we shall see how all classification of texts is made possible only by a co-ordinated and combined study of the three sources of evidence, to which we have briefly alluded, in a pure state.

[1] See also chapter vii. (on Irenaeus).

CHAPTER III

GREEK MANUSCRIPTS

In this chapter some account of the older and more important Greek manuscripts of all or part of the New Testament may be given, more by way of their external characteristics than in regard to their textual quality, which will be more profitably discussed later. A manuscript's importance does not of course depend solely on its age. An old manuscript is likely to be a more faithful representative of its ultimate original only because in its case there has been less time for corruptions to accumulate. It is also useful in considering the history of the text. But a late manuscript may be the last of a series of faithful copies, and may thus preserve a better tradition than another manuscript actually much earlier in date than it. As a matter of fact, we shall see that there is a family likeness between most of the later MSS., and a manuscript's importance to the critic really depends on the extent of its divergence from the normal in readings.

The oldest known pieces of New Testament MS. are $\mathfrak{p}^1$ (Sd ϵ 01),[1] a papyrus fragment found at Oxyrhynchus, in Upper Egypt, and preserved at Philadelphia, U.S.A., containing St. Matthew, chap. i. vers. 1-9, 12, 13, 14-20, and written probably in the third century; and $\mathfrak{p}^5$ (Sd ϵ 02), found at the same place and preserved in the British Museum, London, containing St. John, chap. i. vers. 23-31, 33-41, and chap. xx. vers. 11-17, 19-25, of about the same date. The most considerable piece of papyrus surviving

[1] The former is the number in Gregory's system, adopted in my edition of the Revisers' Greek New Testament. The latter is the number in Von Soden's numeration.

is one which once contained the Epistle to the Hebrews and other books ($\mathfrak{p}^{13}$), but chapters ii. 14–v. 5, x. 8–xi. 13, 28–xii. 17 of the Epistle to the Hebrews alone survive. This MS. was also found at Oxyrhynchus, is preserved in the British Museum, and dates from the early part of the fourth century. On the other side of the roll was written an epitome of Livy's history.

The oldest vellum MS., and the most valuable of all existing MSS. of the New Testament, is that commonly known as B (*Codex Vaticanus graecus*, 1209). This MS. has been in the Vatican Library, Rome, at least since the year 1481, in which one of the oldest extant catalogues was made. It once contained the whole Greek Bible, with the exception of the Books of Maccabees and the possible exception of the Apocalypse. In its actual state the New Testament lacks the Epistle to the Hebrews from chap. ix. ver. 14, the Pastoral Epistles, and the Epistle to Philemon also. The existence, and also the merits of this MS., were to some extent known in previous centuries, and during the nineteenth century our knowledge of it became gradually more and more accurate, the climax being reached in the superb photograph issued by Hoepli of Milan in 1904.[1] Unfortunately even a photograph cannot give a satisfactory reproduction of the beauty of the original writing, as those letters in the MS. which had faded were inked over in the tenth or eleventh century, and equipped with accents and breathings. The Gospels are divided into chapters according to a system almost unique. The order of the parts of the New Testament is Gospels, Acts, Catholic Epistles, Paul.

The MS. is written on very fine vellum, as is usual with our oldest MSS., said to be made of antelopes' skins. It is 27 centimetres square and has now 759 leaves, of which the New Testament occupies 142. There are three narrow columns to the page, recalling the appearance of a papyrus roll, from 40 to 44 lines per column, and from 16 to 18

[1] An exhaustive study of the MS. is expected from the hands of Monsignor Giovanni Mercati, D.D., of the Vatican Library.

letters in a line. Gatherings are in five sheets or ten leaves (twenty pages). The Old Testament was written by two scribes, both of whom are different from the scribe who wrote nearly all the New Testament (actually from Matt. ix. 5 onwards).[1]

There can be no doubt that the manuscript was written in the fourth century, and as to the place of writing, the various clues which have been skilfully followed out have been gradually leading to a result. It is obvious that a large MS. like this will offer many points, textual (including grammatical, etc.) and palæographical, which will help to a conclusion. The text of the Psalms represents, according to Rahlfs,[2] the recension made by Hesychius of Egypt. In the Gospels, again, the readings of our MS. are strikingly supported by the oldest papyrus fragments as they turn up in Egypt, as well as by many of Origen's and Cyril of Alexandria's [3] quotations. In Acts, too, there is the most striking resemblance between the text of B and the quotations of the Alexandrian traveller, Cosmas Indicopleustes, who lived in the sixth century. Further, in the Epistle to the Hebrews (chap. i. ver. 3) a reading of B has the sole support of an Egyptian Greek work attributed to Serapion, and in chap. iii. vers. 2 and 6, it alone of Greek MSS. agrees with a papyrus of Egyptian origin in a reading undoubtedly right. The Egyptian versions, especially the older, the Sahidic, were made from a text very much of this type. Of course, such arguments do not conclusively prove an Egyptian origin for our MS., but they certainly make it highly probable. It is practically decisive, however, that instances of vulgar Egyptian orthography occur in this MS., especially in the central portions of Isaiah.[4]

[1] Traube, *Nomina Sacra*, pp. 66 f.

[2] *Septuaginta-Studien*, ii. (Göttingen, 1907).

[3] In the Cyril Papyrus (saec. vi.); Serruys in *Revue de Philologie*, xxxiii. (1910), 113 ff.

[4] H. St. J. Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*, vol. i (Cambridge, 1909), p. 114, etc. It is right to mention, however, that Traube, on the basis of the practice in the use of contractions for sacred names, decided that B was less Egyptian than Alexandrinus. In *Nomina Sacra*, p. 42, however, he says explicitly of B, 'gewiss aus Ägypten stammt.'

The consideration of the text of B will come more fitly later. Here it may simply be stated that, after all criticisms of those who uphold its high character, it remains the greatest and most important MS. for the New Testament text. There are secondary traces here and there in its text: for example, *μὴ ἑτοιμάσας ἢ ποιήσας* in Luke xii. 47 has all the appearance of an early and widespread conflation, and in Luke xix. 37 *πάντων ὧν εἶδον δυνάμεων*, ungrammatical as it is, represents a transition stage to the ordinary reading *πασῶν*, κ.τ.λ., which would have ousted the original reading *πάντων ὧν εἶδον* (simply, without *δυνάμεων*), but for the fortunate discovery of the Sinai MS. of the Old-Syriac: *δυνάμεων* is, in fact, a marginal gloss to explain the indefinite *πάντων*. But such features are like spots in the sun.

Next in value to B comes ℵ, written later in the fourth century, the *Codex Sinaiticus*, discovered by Tischendorf at the monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai. What remains of it is now preserved mainly at St. Petersburg, having been bought by the Tsar, but a small portion is at Leipzig. Like B, it was once a complete Bible, but, unlike it, it still has the New Testament complete, with the Apocalypse, the so-called Epistle of Barnabas, and a portion of the Shepherd of Hermas. Certain lost leaves may have contained the Didache. It has been conjectured that this MS. and B were two of the fifty Bibles ordered by Constantine from Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea, for the churches in Constantinople. Tischendorf was of opinion that one scribe of this MS. was identical with one of the scribes of B. Certainly the two MSS. are textually closely allied in the New Testament. In this MS. the Epistles of Paul come before Acts. There are some indications that the manuscript from which ℵ was copied was defective or difficult to read in parts; for example, it reads *ἐπαγγελίαν* for *ἐπιταγήν* in 1 Tim. i. 1, and *θέλημα* for *χάρισμα* in 2 Tim. i. 6. Many correctors have been at work on the text.[1] Perhaps the most interesting is one of the seventh

[1] Scribes best distinguished in L. Traube, *Nomina Sacra*, pp. 66 ff. See Lake's *Introduction*, pp. xvii ff., for an account of the correctors.

century (indicated now by ℵ ca), who wrote the subscription to the book of Ezra: 'It has been collated with a very old copy (παλαιότατον ἀντίγραφον), which was collated by the hand of the holy martyr Pamphilus, which copy at the end had a subscription in his own hand to the following effect: "Taken and corrected according to the Hexapla of Origen. Antonius collated; I, Pamphilus, corrected."' Pamphilus is the venerated friend of Eusebius of Caesarea, who died a martyr's death in 309. Together they founded at Caesarea a library of biblical and patristic writings on papyrus rolls, the nucleus of which consisted of Origen's voluminous writings, especially his editions and interpretations of biblical books. After the Book of Esther there is a similar subscription, and with regard to the Book of Psalms it is certain that the corrector's copy agreed with that of Eusebius, while that of the original scribe was of a different type. It is clear, therefore, that in the seventh century our MS. was at Caesarea. As to its original home authorities vary. It is perfectly clear, however, that the prophetical portion of the Old Testament was either written by an Egyptian scribe, or copied from a parent MS. written by an Egyptian scribe.[1] The palæography of the MS. is also, according to Crum, closely akin to many of the older Coptic hands.[2] It would seem, therefore, that we must look to Egypt for the origin of this MS. also. St. Jerome at Bethlehem had a MS. closely related to ℵ, in St. Matthew's Gospel, as we learn from his references in his commentary on that Gospel.[3]

In all, 346½ leaves of this MS. have survived, of which the New Testament occupies 147½. The manuscript is written on thin vellum. The pages measure 43 by 37·8 centimetres, arranged in four narrow columns of writing, each containing 48 lines. The writing is rather a large uncial. The margins of the text bear the section numbers

[1] The peculiar orthography makes this clear: Thackeray, *Grammar of the O. T. in Greek*, pp. 112 ff.

[2] Thackeray, *op. cit.*, p. 72.

[3] *Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine*, ed. Wordsworth and White, i. 658 f.

compiled for the Gospels by Eusebius, who died in 340.

The next uncial which falls to be mentioned is that known by the symbol A, the *Codex* '*Alexandrinus*,' which has been much the best known to Western scholars during the past three centuries. Now the chief ornament of the manuscript department of the British Museum, this manuscript was offered to James I. of England [1] by Cyril Lucar, who was Patriarch of Alexandria till 1621, and afterwards of Constantinople (1621-38). The history of the MS., prior to its coming into the hands of Lucar, is obscure. An Arabic note in it shows that it was in the Patriarchal Library at Cairo at the time the note was written by 'the humble Athanasius,' who would appear to be, as Professor Burkitt thinks, the librarian of that library in Lucar's day. According to the statement of a deacon of Cyril's, Cyril obtained the MS. from Mount Athos in 1616. If this be true, the connexion of the MS. with Alexandria is fortuitous, and it is really a Constantinople MS., as indeed the character of its text would lead one to conjecture.[2]

The manuscript, written in the fifth century, now contains 773 leaves, but originally had 822, of which the New Testament with the Letters of Clement occupies 143. Each leaf measures 32 by 26·3 centimetres, there are two columns to the page, and the writing is in a firm and fairly large square uncial hand. When complete, the manuscript contained the whole of the Old and New Testaments, as well as the First Epistle of Clement of Rome, the homily which is usually known as Second Clement, and the apocryphal work known as the Psalms of Solomon. The following parts are now wanting: Matt. i. 1–xxv. 6, John vi. 50–viii. 52, 2 Cor. iv. 13–xii. 6, and the Psalms of Solomon.

The manuscript known by the symbol C, the *Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus*, is now the mere débris of what was

[1] And actually received by Charles I. through Sir Thomas Roe, our Ambassador to the Porte, as James had died shortly after his acceptance of the offer.

[2] I follow Professor Burkitt's account (*Journal of Theological Studies*, xi. 603 ff., July 1910).

once a stately codex. Written in the fifth century, the manuscript contained originally the whole of the Greek Bible, but when it had become old-fashioned and mutilated, the portions of it we now possess were used in the twelfth century to receive thirty-eight treatises in Syriac of St. Ephraim the Syrian Father († 373). Vellum was in many places scarce at the time, and it was possible to wash or rub off the writing with sufficient thoroughness to permit of the reception of fresh writing on the old sheets. A manuscript so treated is known as a *palimpsest* (πάλιν, again, ψάω, I wipe). The libraries of Europe contain a fair number of such manuscripts,[1] the decipherment of which puts a great strain on the eyesight. Tischendorf was able to recover some portions of every book in the New Testament except the Second Epistle of John and the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians.

Of the 238 leaves, which the New Testament would have occupied when complete, only 145 remain. They measure 33 by 26·6 centimetres, have one column only to the page, usually of forty-one lines, each containing about forty letters, which are a little larger than those in B, ℵ, and A.

No manuscript surpasses in interest the celebrated Graeco-Latin *Codex Bezae* (D), the greatest literary treasure of the University of Cambridge, England. It comes first into notice in the sixteenth century, when it was brought by the Bishop of Clermont to the Council of Trent (1546).[2] It was used by Henricus Stephanus for his *editio regia* of the Greek New Testament, published at Paris in 1550. Theodorus Beza, the Genevan Reformer, who had obtained it from the monastery of St. Irenaeus at Lyons in 1562,

[1] A list of them has been published by Emile Chatelain.

[2] I assume with Dom H. Quentin (*Revue Bénédictine* [1906], pp. 1-23) that the 'antiquissimus quidam Graecus codex, quem Tridentum attulit Claromontanensis Episcopus anno Domini 1546' (*S. Hieronymi Stridonensis Opera. . . . diligentia et labore Mariani Victorii Reatini, Episcopi Amerini* . . . tom. i. (Paris, 1609), p. 509 F.), which read οὕτως after μένειν in Ioh. xxi. 22, is the same as the 'antiquissimo codice Lugdunensi' (*op. cit.* p. 510 F.), which read *uocabis* in Matt. i. 23, though it looks as if Victorius himself had not been aware of their identity. There is just a possibility that there were two kindred MSS., one at Clermont (in Auvergne), the other at Lyons. (The original edition of Victorius's *Jerome* appeared at Rome in 1566.)

gave it to the University of Cambridge in 1581, accompanied by a characteristic epistle. As to its early history there has been much speculation. On the whole, there seems most reason to connect it with Lyons itself. The archetype of its Greek side, as we shall see later, shared most striking readings with the copies of the Gospels and Acts used by St. Irenaeus of Lyons himself. Again, in the ninth century, the martyrologist Ado, who probably wrote at Lyons, makes use of a text of Acts which is the same as that in *Codex Bezae*, but otherwise unknown.[1]

The manuscript has been commonly assigned to the sixth century, but there is just as much reason to attribute it to the fifth. It now contains Matthew, John, Luke, Mark (in this order), 3 John 11-15 (in Latin only), and Acts.[2] Dom John Chapman has calculated from the make-up of the manuscript that it originally comprised also the Apocalypse and 1 and 2 John, these following immediately on Mark (in that order).[3] The books that survive are not in themselves complete, as the following parts are lacking: in the Greek (which is always on the left), Matt. i. 1-20, vi. 20–ix. 2, xxvii. 2-12, John i. 16–iii. 26, Acts viii. 29–x. 14, xxi. 2-10, 15-18, xxii. 10-20, xxii. 29–xxviii. 31; in the Latin (always on the right), Matt. i. 1-11, vi. 8–viii. 27, xxvi. 65–xxvii. 1, John i. 1–iii. 16, Acts viii. 20–x. 4, xx. 31–xxi. 2, xxi. 7-10, xxii. 2-10, xxii. 20–xxviii. 31. Whereas it has now 406 leaves, it must have had originally at least 510. Each page contains only one column (and therefore writing in one language only), and measures 26 by 21·5 centimetres. The lines are short sense-lines, suitable for reading aloud. The writing is rather a large uncial, betraying a certain awkwardness, and there is a decided likeness between the shapes of the Greek and Latin letters.

In the particular community in which the book was used, the Bible was read in Greek either generally or occasionally, but the community itself was Latin-speaking.

[1] Dom Quentin, *op. cit.*
[2] But Acts followed immediately on Mark in the archetype.
[3] *Expositor*, 1905, ii. 46 ff.

The Latin side (*d*) is then a sort of 'crib' to the Greek side (D). The vulgarisms and errors in it forbid us to suppose that it was intended for formal and public reading. Neither side is simply a rendering of the other. There are many discrepancies between the two, and the two texts are in a sense of separate origin. The actual character of *Codex Bezae* is best explained in the words of Professor Burkitt, whom I am following in this section, as so often elsewhere:[1] 'This, of course, might take place in many ways. The most obvious is that the immediate ancestor of *Codex Bezae* was a Greek MS., of which a Latin translation was made by some one who was familiar with one of the current Latin versions;[2] on this hypothesis some readings of this Latin translation were the result of literal translation from the opposite side, others will differ from the Greek side and agree with the current ecclesiastical Latin. Under these circumstances the Greek side might be corrected here and there to agree verbally with the Latin on the opposite page. Our *Codex Bezae* (on this hypothesis) is a transcript of this bilingual so corrected: D therefore contains some readings which are a mere literal translation of a not absolutely literal Latin version, while most of the differences of *d* from the bulk of Latin MSS. are instances where the scholar who produced the translation deserted the ordinary Latin renderings to make his work agree more literally with the Greek on the opposite side.' Dr. Burkitt gives three examples to prove his points. In Luke xxii. 61 the two sides differ: D (with one other Greek MS., and three Old-Latin) adds μὴ εἰδέναι με after ἀπαρνήσῃ με, but *d* omits with the bulk of the authorities, here retaining the basal Latin rendering. In Matt. xx. 2 D and *d* (as often) agree against other Latin texts (ἡμέραν, *diem*, against *diurno*). In Matt. x. 24 the

[1] 'The Date of Codex Bezae,' in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. iii. (1901-2), pp. 501-13.

[2] May I, not Professor Burkitt, point out that in Luke xv., which I have specially studied, there are several interesting agreements with *a* (for which see the next chapter), where all other Old-Latin authorities go a different way? Elsewhere we find *d* sometimes in agreement with *k*. (See the next chapter.)

προσφέρεις of D (for πρόσφερε) is best explained by supposing that the *offeres* of the Latin side (really a colloquial form of the imperative) was mistaken for an indicative, and thus rendered back into a Greek indicative.

More than a dozen later scribes have left their marks on the MS. Only one need be considered here, the one called by Scrivener G. He was a scholar, not a professional scribe; probably, in fact, the bishop for whose church the MS. was made, and therefore contemporary with the original writing. He makes alterations in the Latin in the interests of scholarship throughout St. Matthew and in the early chapters of Acts.

Another manuscript, also known as D, but to distinguish it from the last as D_2 or D^{paul}, is the Graeco-Latin *Codex Claromontanus*, so called because formerly at Clermont in Beauvais, but now preserved at Paris. It contains the Epistles of Paul, including Hebrews (a later addition to the MS.), with the exception of Rom. i. 1-7, 27-30, and 1 Cor. xiv. 13-22, of which the Greek side is lost. The MS. was written in the sixth century, contains 533 leaves, measuring 24·6 by 19·5 centimetres, with one column of twenty-one lines to the page. The Greek is on the left side and the Latin on the right. The MS. is the leading 'Western' authority for the text of the Epistles. The Latin side is not always dependent on the Greek. In fact, with the exception of harmonisations with the Vulgate Latin text in the longer Epistles, the Latin side is precisely the same text as Lucifer of Cagliari (in Sardinia) uses in his writings in the fourth century. It was this fact that led me, taking into account the fact that Sardinia in the sixth century became a province of the Byzantine Empire, and therefore officially Greek-speaking, to conjecture that the MS. is of Sardinian origin.[1] It contains an interesting transposition

[1] *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. vi. pp. 240-3. The suggestion was considered worthy of mention by Traube, *Nomina Sacra*, p. 177, and Gregory, *Textkritik*, p. 1040, but has been ignored by Nestle, *Einf.* (ed. 3), 73. There is a close relationship in abbreviations, etc., between D^{paul} and D^{evv}. (Traube, *op. cit.*, pp. 178 f.). It may be that D^{evv} is also a Sardinian book: Nestle, *loc. cit.*, goes so far as to say that D^{paul} is 'offenbar ursprünglich damit (*i.e.* with D^{evv}) zusammengehörig.' See below on E.

in 1 Cor. xiv., where verses 34 and 35 come after verse 40.[1]

E (or more precisely E^a), a Latino-Greek manuscript of the Acts of the Apostles, preserved at Oxford, has had an extraordinarily romantic history. Written in Sardinia towards the end of the sixth century, it somehow found its way to Northumbria, where the Venerable Bede used it in the compilation of his commentary on Acts (between 709 and 716).[2] Given soon after amongst other precious books to Boniface, when he started on his mission to the Continent, it was probably later transferred by him to Burchard, when Boniface consecrated him Bishop of Würzburg (Bavaria). In the Thirty Years' War (in the seventeenth century) Würzburg was sacked, and this manuscript among others was acquired from the Swedish army by Archbishop Laud, who in due course presented it to the Bodleian Library. The MS. lacks from chap. xxvi. 29 to the end.

H (or more precisely H^p), once a complete manuscript of the Epistles of St. Paul, was already in the thirteenth century (and perhaps earlier) used by bookbinders as fly-leaves for other books in one of the monasteries on Mount Athos. Forty-one leaves only out of about 450 are known, and are divided between six different places: 22 at Paris, 8 at Athos, 3 at St. Petersburg, 3 at Moscow, 3 at Kiev, and 2 at Turin. The ingenuity of Monsieur Omont, Dean Robinson, and Professor Lake has recovered the readings of twenty-two other pages from the 'off-sets' left by them on the pages opposite. We thus possess the text of the following parts of the Epistles, about a ninth of the entire text: 1 Cor. x. 19-32, xi. 6-20; 2 Cor. iv. 2-7, x. 5–xi. 8, xi. 12–xii. 4; Gal. capitula 9-12, i. 1-10, ii. 9-17, iv. 27–v. 10; Col. i. 23–ii. 11, ii. 17–iii. 11; 1 Thess. ii. 9-13, iv. 4-11; Hebr. capitula 6-11, i. 3-8, ii. 9-18, iii. 13-18, iv. 12-15, x. 1-7, 32-38, xii. 10-18, xiii. 21-25 and title;

[1] For other authorities see my critical apparatus.

[2] *Venerabilis Baedae Historiam Ecclesiasticam* . . . recogn. . . . C. Plummer, tom. i. (Oxon. 1896), p. cxlvii.

1 Tim. capitula 1-18, i. 4–iii. 2, iii. 7-14, vi. 9-13; 2 Tim. i. 17–ii. 9; Tit. capitula 2-6, and i. 1-3, i. 15–ii. 5, iii. 13-15 and title, with the colophon to the whole book, stating that it was written στιχηδόν (*i.e.* in sense-lines), and was collated with the copy in the library of Caesarea written by the hand of Pamphilus. The writing in its present state is clumsy, but this is due to the fact that the original characters have been worked over. The MS. dates from the latter half of the fifth or from the sixth century. Its interest, apart from the purity of its text, centres mainly in the fact that it purports to be a copy of an early edition of the Epistles of Paul, equipped with prolegomena, chapter divisions and chapter headings by one Euthalius (or Evagrius—the name cannot be read for certain).[1]

The *Codex Regius*, known as L, is an eighth-century MS. of the Gospels in Paris. It wants portions of Matthew, Mark, and John, the chief point of interest being that it contains both endings to Mark, a peculiarity shared with four other uncials, one minuscule, and one form of the Sahidic and of the Ethiopic versions.[2] The text of the MS. as a whole is interesting as preserving many early elements amidst later material.

The Gospel manuscripts known as N, O, Σ, and Φ may fitly be treated together. All are of the sixth century, written in gold or silver letters on purple-stained vellum, perhaps in the same workshop at Constantinople. All are defective, but each serves in a measure to supplement the defects of the others. Finally, all represent the same type of text; according to Burkitt, that which was most in vogue at Constantinople in the age of Justinian;[3] according to Von Soden, the text used by the great Cappadocian Fathers, Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory of Nazianzus, in the last third of the fourth century.[4]

[1] See p. 12.

[2] See the evidence in my note at the end of Mark, and add a Graeco-Sahidic MS. since published by Heer in *Oriens Christianus* for 1912, pp. 1-47.

[3] *Journal of Theological Studies*, i. 626. (He is speaking of N and Σ only.)

[4] *Die Schriften des N. T.*, u.s.w. Bd. i. (Berlin, 1902-10), pp. 1466 ff. The two views need not be inconsistent.

What remains of N is distributed between five different libraries: 182 leaves being at St. Petersburg, 53 at Patmos, 6 in Rome, 4 in London, and 2 in Vienna. O, which contains most of the second half of St. Matthew, was bought in 1899 by an officer of the French army at or near Sinope in Pontus, and is now in Paris, except for one leaf, which is at Mariupolis on the Sea of Azov. Σ is at Rossano, in South Italy, and contains only Matthew and Mark: it is remarkable from the artistic point of view. Φ, at Berat, in Albania, contains the same two Gospels with *lacunae*. Of these four, only one was known to scholars before 1880, and that very imperfectly. It is not at all impossible that others of the same kind, or lost portions of these, may turn up any day in the Levant.

W.—To this manuscript one can merely call attention, as at the moment of writing very little is known about it. Formerly in the library of the monastery of Schenute at Atripe (near Sohag), opposite Akhmim, in Egypt,[1] it is a complete codex of the Gospels, which came into the possession of C. L. Freer, Esq., of Detroit, Michigan, U.S.A., early in 1906. Written not earlier than the fourth century, and not later than the sixth, it is remarkable in giving the Gospels in the 'Western' order, Matthew, John, Luke, Mark, and in containing an interpolation within the longer ending of St. Mark, for which no other Greek authority is known to be extant.

Considerations of space do not permit much reference to the minuscule MSS. Their interest, like that of all other MSS., depends on the extent of their deviation from the normal, and their classification, which began about a generation ago, has been very far advanced by Von Soden and his collaborators. Perhaps the most interesting group is the so-called Ferrar group, which comprises now about a dozen manuscripts,[2] distinguished from all others principally by the fact that they give the section about the

[1] This origin is, however, disputed by Sanders in his 1911 edition of the *Deuteronomy* and *Joshua* MS. from the same hoard.

[2] Namely, 13, 69, 124, 230, 346, 543, 788, 826, 828, 983, 1689, 1709.

adulterous woman (John vii. 53–viii. 11) not in John's Gospel at all, but after Luke xxi. 38. Either position is of course due to some editor, as the section in question is no part of the Fourth Gospel, but the Ferrar group alone contains it in the position named. The manuscripts forming this group were written at various dates between the eleventh and fifteenth centuries, and by carefully following up clues afforded by the characteristics of the MSS. themselves, scholars have proved that the archetype (or original) of all must have been either in Calabria or in Sicily.[1]

[1] See Ferrar and Abbott's edition (Dublin, 1877); Abbé Martin, *Quatre Manuscrits Importants* (Paris, 1886); R. Harris, *The Origin of the Ferrar Group* (Cambridge, 1893); K. Lake in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. i. (1899-1900), pp. 117-20.

CHAPTER IV

THE OLDER VERSIONS: LATIN AND SYRIAC

§ 1. Latin (Old)

From about the beginning of the second century B.C. Greek became almost a second language in Italy. Especially after the annexation of Greece as a Roman Province in 146 B.C., under the name of Achaia, the influx of Greeks to Rome was enormous. The Greek peoples were strong where the Romans were weak. The Roman had all the genius for law and order; he was the perfect soldier, but the Greek excelled in all the subtler arts. Very soon the medical profession, for instance, was practically confined to Greeks: from them also were drawn the painters, sculptors, teachers, and cooks of the rapidly developing Roman Republic. Multitudes of the slaves and freedmen were Greeks: the lower orders in Rome, much recruited from this class, acquired an easy familiarity with the Greek language. At the other pole of society education was not complete without a study of Greek. As the language was left in possession by the Romans in the East, and became a second official language of the State, it was necessary that all administrators should have facility in its use. Society from the top to the bottom was bilingual, and Greek and Latin were referred to usually by the simple phrase *both languages* (*utraque lingua*, ἑκατέρα γλῶσσα).[1]

It is necessary to realise this fact fully in order to under-

[1] See my article *Did St. Paul Speak Latin?* in the *Expositor* for April 1911, p. 338.

stand the genesis and history of Latin versions of Scripture or parts of Scripture in the West. Christianity came to the West in the first instance as a Greek thing. The Church of Rome is addressed by Paul in Greek (A.D. 56-7); the Church of Rome through Clement writes a letter in Greek to the Church of Corinth (A.D. 95-6); the bishops have all got Greek names down to Victor (A.D. 189). The anti-pope Hippolytus as late as the period 200 to 230 writes all his voluminous works in Greek, and good Greek too. Irenaeus, native of Asia Minor, writes his five books against the Gnostic heresies in Greek about 185, though his church was Lyons. Briefly it may be said that every one in Italy and Sicily understood Greek, and in certain parts of Gaul and Spain, particularly on the Mediterranean seaboard, it was equally well known.

This being the case, it will be seen that the translation of the sacred books into Latin becomes unnecessary until a reading population is reached which is ignorant of Greek. Christianity doubtless first influenced the middle class, which is always of higher morality and not infrequently of better education than the other classes of society.[1] Only as Christianity in the West spread more widely or penetrated to the lowest strata of society would translations into Latin be required. The very character of the oldest Latin translations of biblical books known to us, careless and colloquial, shows that they can have been intended only for the uneducated. For centuries it had been an accepted canon that the language of literature must be very different from that of conversation. In the fourth century the attempt was made, particularly by Jerome, to polish these early translations.

The position of Greek in the Western half of the Empire begins to be insecure with the loosening of the bonds between East and West, which culminated in the creation of two empires in the first quarter of the fourth century, one Latin and the other Greek. When this separation

[1] Cf. Orr, *Some Neglected Factors in the Early History of Christianity* (London, 1899).

had become complete, the knowledge of Greek in the West was confined to a highly educated class, and translations of Greek works became, for the first time since the age of the Republic, the order of the day.

An important exception to the general situation is to be found in the province called 'Africa,' the territory of ancient Carthage, which was definitely annexed by Rome in 146 B.C. Latin was there the official language and the language of civilisation, and there can be no doubt that in this thickly populated and well-evangelised country translations would be an earlier necessity than elsewhere. The probability is that 'Africa' was originally evangelised direct from Rome itself, but of the beginnings of Christianity in Africa we know nothing for certain. The Semitic antecedents of the country may account for the rapid growth of Christianity there. The whole history, however, is dark till the end of the third quarter of the second century. Then, in the 'Acts' of the Scillitan[1] Martyrs, who met their death by decapitation in 180, light begins to dawn. The *libri et epistulae Pauli*, which they had, can hardly have been in any other language but Latin.[2] It is perfectly clear from references in Tertullian, who wrote at Carthage (mainly in Latin, but also in Greek) between A.D. 195 and 218, that Latin translations of at least some parts of Scripture existed in his time. Tertullian's regular practice was to use the Greek original and to translate for himself.[3] But, in addition to his actual mention of existing Latin translations, it is clear that he sometimes used them himself. A study of his quotations by Monceaux has shown that he must have possessed translations of Luke, John, Galatians, First Corinthians, Romans and Ephesians.[4]

[1] Scilli was in Numidia. The *Acts* are published in the appendix to Dean Robinson's *The Passion of S. Perpetua* (*Texts and Studies*, vol. i. No. 2, Cambridge, 1891).

[2] P. Monceaux, *Histoire Littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*, etc., t. i. (Paris, 1901), pp. 105 f. Chapter iii. pp. 97-173 is a valuable account of 'La Bible Latine en Afrique.'

[3] An interesting case occurs in his quotation of Heb. vi. 5, where it is clear that his Greek copy had lost one short line. See p. 86.

[4] Monceaux, *op. cit.*, pp. 110, 113-18.

The existence of a (relatively) complete New Testament in Africa first comes into clear view in the writings of Cyprian († 258), who quotes a Latin Bible abundantly and accurately. The fact that on close study the translation used by him shows secondary characteristics [1] confirms the conclusion that in Tertullian's time a Latin New Testament already existed in Africa, and suggests that it is the result of a long period of translation commenced not later than 150. There was, however, in Cyprian's time no one official version. For instance, a Bishop Nemesianus of Tubunas (on the confines of Numidia and Mauritania), who was present at the Rebaptism Council of Carthage in A.D. 256 with Cyprian himself, uses a Latin translation which differs from that employed by him, and is probably earlier in origin.[2] The texts used in Africa down to about the end of the fourth century (and in some cases even later) are substantially identical with Cyprian's, though some have been subjected to revision in varying degrees.[3] In particular, the quotations of the Donatists show that they clung more closely to old-fashioned texts than the Catholics did. Details may be more fittingly reserved for Chapter VI.

In this department of our subject, as elsewhere, we start from the chronological and local basis provided by quotations in authors, and this method has enabled Drs. Hort, Sanday, Burkitt, and Hans von Soden, each profiting by the work of his predecessors, to identify certain existing manuscripts as belonging to the 'African' family. We shall proceed to enumerate these.

'African' Gospel MSS.

k. The symbol *k* is applied to a MS. (with one column to the page), which now contains no more than Mark

[1] *E.g.* in Luke xii. 47 Cyprian's *paruerit* is a corruption of the primitive *parauerit* (C. H. Turner in *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. ii. pp. 606 f.); in 2 Tim. iv. 3 κνηθόμενοι τὴν ἀκοήν is rendered twice over.

[2] C. H. Turner in *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. ii. pp. 602-6.

[3] *Old-Latin Bibl. Texts*, ii. pp. lxxxv ff. [Victorinus?] *De Physicis*, Optatus, *De Pascha Computus* (Burkitt, *Old Latin and the Itala*, p. 7).

viii. 8-11, 14-16; viii. 19–xvi. 9, and Matt. i. 1–iii. 10; iv. 2–xiv. 17; xv. 20-36. The manuscript was written not later than 400 A.D. in Africa, and probably passed through Spain to the Irish monastery of Bobbio in North Italy, in the splendid library of which it was preserved for many centuries until it found a home in the public library at Turin, where it now is.[1] The manuscript is very inaccurate, and was probably copied from a cursive original. It gives a text practically identical with the quotations of St. Cyprian.[2] It is also notable for the fact that it contains (only) the shorter ending to St. Mark's Gospel. What is distinctive in the 'African' Old-Latin texts is the choice of renderings more than differences of underlying Greek text. A predilection, for instance, for *sermo* as a rendering for λόγος (rather than *verbum*), for *expello*, *excludo* as renderings for ἐκβάλλω[3] (rather than *eicio*), for *felix* as a rendering for μακάριος (rather than *beatus*), and such like, marks off 'African' texts from those used outside.

e. This symbol is given to a MS. (with two columns to the page) which contains the following portions of the four Gospels: Matt. xii. 49–xiv. 11, xiv. 22–xxiv. 50, xxviii. 2-20; Mark i. 20–iv. 8, iv. 19–vi. 9, xii. 37-40, xiii. 2-3, 24-27, 33-36; Luke i. 1–viii. 30, viii. 48–xi. 4, xi. 24–xxiv. 53; John i. 1–xviii. 12, xviii. 25–xxi. 25. A copy of two further fragments, made in 1762, has recently been discovered in Rome (containing Matt. xiv. 11-22).[4] The MS. was written in the fifth century. It is one of the class of purple MSS., with silver and gold lettering, and very narrow columns. Native, no doubt, to Africa, it found its way to Trent, and, except for the one leaf at Dublin, is now at Vienna. It is only for 108 verses or parts of verses that both *k* and *e* have survived, and comparison

[1] It was scorched, but no more than scorched, by the disastrous fire of January 1904.

[2] Comparison between *k* and Cyprian in *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, ii. (Oxford, 1886), pp. xlii-lxvii (Sanday), and Hans von Soden, *Das lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur Zeit Cyprians* (Leipzig, 1909), pp. 111-34.

[3] *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, ii. p. lxxxvi.

[4] Linke in *Sitz. Bay. Akad.*, 1893(2), 281-7.

between them is possible. The result of this comparison is to show that, while the underlying basis is in both cases the same, *e* has many differences from *k*, and should be regarded as a later partial revision of the *k* type, according to models current in the fourth century on the northern side of the Mediterranean.[1] Augustine probably employed a Gospel text of this kind before 400.

Isolated African readings are also to be found in a late MS. *c* (*Codex Colbertinus*). For example, at the end of St. Luke (chaps. xxiii. and xxiv.) a comparison with *e* and Cyprian shows clear 'African' traces amidst general 'Europeanism.'[2] And *c* is not quite alone in this: other Latin MSS. show occasional 'African' characteristics, not even excepting Irish or semi-Irish manuscripts of the eighth and ninth centuries, such as *gat*.[3] Moreover, Dom de Bruyne has recently recovered African readings from chapter headings in various MSS., whose connexion with Africa had never been suspected.[4]

'African' MS. of Acts

h. This MS. (with one column to the page), known as the Fleury Palimpsest, is proved to contain an African text by the notable agreement between its readings and those of Cyprian, Augustine, and the Auctor *De Promissionibus*.[5] The manuscript contains chaps. iii. 2–iv. 18, v. 23–vii. 2; vii. 42–viii. 2; ix. 4-23; xiv. 5-23; xvii. 34–xviii. 19; xxiii. 8-24; xxvi. 20–xxvii. 13, besides portions of the

[1] Comparison between *k* and *e* in Sanday, *op. cit.*, pp. lxvii-lxxxv; Hans von Soden, *op. cit.*, 184-221.

[2] Burkitt, *The Old Latin and the Itala* (*Texts and Studies*, vol. iv. No. 3 [Cambr. 1896], pp. 35-40), with which compare my reconstruction from Augustine's citations in *Journal of Theological Studies*, xii. (1910-11), p. 155.

[3] *I.e.* the *Evangelium Gatianum* (formerly of S. Gatien of Tours, now at Paris) (ed. J. M. Heer, Freiburg i. Br. 1910). Cf. Burkitt in *Journal of Theological Studies*, xi. (1909-10), p. 608; Lawlor's *Book of Mulling*, pp. 134 ff.; the corrector of the European *n*.

[4] *Revue Bénédictine* for 1910, pp. 273-324 and later. See also Rev. G. M. Youngman in *Amer. Journ. Theol.*, xiv. (1910), p. 625.

[5] Cf. Corssen, *Der Africanische Text der Acta Apostolorum* (progr. Berlin, 1892); Monceaux, *op. cit.*, p. 152; Hans von Soden, *op. cit.*, pp. 221-42.

Catholic Epistles and the Apocalypse, which will be considered in their proper places. The MS., of which this is the original writing, was written in the fifth century, either in Africa, or elsewhere after an African model.[1] The upper writing (saec. vii.) is Isidore *De Mundo*.

'*African*' *MS. of Catholic Epistles*

h. The same MS. contains the following fragments of the Catholic Epistles: First Peter iv. 17–Second Peter ii. 7, and First John i. 8-iii. 20. The presence of Second Peter, an epistle apparently unknown to Tertullian and Cyprian, suggests that *h* represents a rather late form of African text in this part, and internal evidence supports the view: for example, in First John iii. 17 the *agape* of Cyprian's Bible appears as *caritas*.[2]

'*African*' *MS. of Pauline Epistles*

r. A fragmentary MS. written in the fifth or sixth century, now preserved at Munich, containing portions of Romans, First and Second Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, First Timothy and Hebrews, represents the type of text habitually used by St. Augustine for this part of the Bible.[3]

'*African*' *MS. of the Apocalypse of John*

h, the same MS. as above indicated, contains chaps. i. 1–ii. 1, viii. 7–ix. 12, xi. 16–xii. 14, xiv. 15–xvi. 5 only of the Apocalypse. Its African character is proved by what it shares with African writers, Cyprian, Tyconius, and Primasius. The last provides a complete African text of early type amid his commentary, a compilation of the sixth century.

[1] Traube, *Nomina Sacra*, pp. 191, 200-1.
[2] Cf. Berger, *Le Palimpseste de Fleury*, p. 18; Burkitt, *Old Latin and the Itala*, p. 58.
[3] 2 Cor. v. 1-12, 14–vi. 3 in *Revue Bénédictine*, xxviii. (1911), 221 7 (G. Morin).

Of the early history of Latin texts on the northern side of the Mediterranean we know even less than of the African. Not a single certain quotation is found earlier than Novatian, the contemporary of Cyprian. It may be that the text, which for purposes of convenience we call 'African,' really took its rise in Europe: we cannot say. The question, also, whether the texts we call African are of quite independent origin from those we call European is one that has been the subject of a good deal of dispute. On the one hand, Professor Burkitt speaks of the European text as 'a continuous development, or rather *degeneration*, from the African standard,' while on the other, Professor Von Soden thinks that the two had a separate origin.[1] The fundamental unity of European texts is shown by their agreement in rendering εἰ δὲ μή[γε] by *sin autem* in Luke x. 6 and xiii. 9 only, whereas in the other nine places they are almost unanimous for *alioquin*:[2] there the Africans read *si quo minus*. Yet there is a notable unity in corruption in Mark ix. 15, where both African and European have *gaudentes* (προσχέροντες) (an error for προστρέχοντες).

European Gospel MSS.

a. The premier European manuscript of the Gospels, fittingly if accidentally known by the first letter of the alphabet, is the *Codex Vercellensis*, preserved in a glass case at Vercelli in North Italy. The writing is in double columns, as is usual in the older Latin MSS., with twenty-four lines to the column. It is an old tradition that the manuscript was written by the very hand of St. Eusebius, Bishop of Vercelli, who was martyred in 371, and there is nothing to disprove this tradition. As a sacred relic, it has suffered much from the kisses of worshippers through-

[1] Cf. Burkitt in *Encycl. Bibl.* col. 4993; Hermann von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, i. pp. 1545-50.

[2] Burkitt, *Old Latin and the Itala*, p. 41, who also gives other illustrations.

out the centuries, and was recently removed to Rome for a time to be repaired. Next to *k*, it is the most important Old-Latin manuscript of the Gospels. Its age proves that its text cannot have been in any way contaminated with the Vulgate, as the latter was not issued till 383-4. The real antiquity of its type of text is proved by other arguments also. Novatian in the middle of the third century in Rome employed such a text as *a*, and in St. John's Gospel Lucifer of Cagliari (Sardinia), a friend of Eusebius, generally quotes a text agreeing with *a*.[1] Further, St. Jerome himself, at least for the Gospel of Luke, regularly cited a text practically identical with *a*, though he must have had many different types at his disposal.[2] The fragmentary manuscript known as *n* (Chur, S. Gallen) (saec. iv.-v.) is, except in St. John,[3] a sister MS. to *a*. We have thus traces of five different copies of this type.

The type contains more 'African' readings than any other European MS., and it probably represents an altogether earlier stage of the European Latin than *b* (and others). The manuscript *n* supplies lacunae in Mark xv.-xvi. and Luke xi. 11-29, where *a* is now defective. There is a very considerable difference between the *a n* type, and that which is provided by the remaining Old-Latin MSS.

b. The *Codex Veronensis*, known as *b*, is a purple-stained MS., with silver, and occasionally gold, writing, written in the fifth or sixth century, and preserved, probably continuously from that date to ours, at Verona.[4] It contains the Gospels in the usual order in Old-Latin MSS., Matthew, John, Luke, Mark,[5] save that the following parts are lacking: Matt. i. 1-11, xv. 12-22, xxiii. 18-27, John vii. 44–viii. 12, Luke xix. 26–xxi. 29, Mark xiv. 61–end. Thus a

[1] *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, ii. p. 140; Burkitt, *op. cit.*, p. 15 f. Yet John vi. 26-27 *ap.* Nouat. *cib. Iud.* c. 5 (pp. 236, 9 ff.) is far from *a*.

[2] See the present writer in the *British Congregationalist* for 9th June 1910, *Journal of Theological Studies* for July 1911, pp. 583-92, and H. C. Hoskier, *The Golden Latin Gospels*, etc. (New York, 1910), pp. xxvii-xxix, cxiv.

[3] In St. John *n* is secondary as compared with *a*.

[4] It passed in the seventeenth century into the Chapter Library of the Cathedral, having been formerly in the possession of the Saibante family (Buchanan's edition of *b*, p. vii).

[5] The apostles being placed first.

BIBLIOTHECA COLL. NOV.

manuscript, which originally contained 418 leaves, now contains only 393, of which seven are illegible, because the ink has eaten away the written parts. The writing is in double columns of eighteen lines, each containing on an average ten or eleven letters. Two correctors of the MS. substituted Vulgate readings on occasion for the original readings of the MS., and did so with such neatness that the fact escaped notice, until the Rev. E. S. Buchanan, the latest editor, discovered it. His edition (Clarendon Press, 1911), for this and other reasons, antiquates those of his predecessors.[1] This discovery is of consequence in estimating the character of *b*, as Professor Burkitt considers it to represent the type which Jerome used as the basis of the Vulgate. Whether this be so or not, *b* occupies a kind of central position amongst the European Old-Latin MSS., as the others all resemble *b* more closely than they resemble each other.[2] The type of text present in *b* is found in Niceta of Remesiana (in Dacia), the author of the *Te Deum* (*flor.* 400),[3] in the 'Ambrosiaster,' resident at Rome about 375,[4] and, so far as Luke is concerned, in Lucifer of Cagliari.[5]

d is the symbol for the Latin side of D (*Codex Bezae*), described in the last chapter.[6] It does not in the same sense as the others represent an uniform Latin version, as it has been much corrected by its own Greek. It nevertheless in great part preserves a translation which is really old, as it has points of contact with readings of *k* and of *a*, where all other authorities differ: certain elements in *d*, then, cannot be of later date than the first half of the third century, and may be earlier still.

ff (or ff_2) is the symbol for *Codex Corbeiensis* (Paris,

[1] See his introduction, pp. xiv-xx.
[2] Prof. H. J. White, *Old-Latin Biblical Texts* iii. (Oxford, 1888), p. xxii.
[3] Burkitt in Burn's edition of *Niceta* (Cambr. 1905), pp. cxlvi-cxlix.
[4] Souter, *Study of Ambrosiaster* (Cambr. 1905), pp. 205 f. He had Luke xxiii. 34, which has now been found to be in the first hand of *b*. The wording does not exactly agree.
[5] *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, ii. p. 140.
[6] Pp. 25 ff.

Bibliothèque Nationale 17,225), of the fifth century, which has double columns of twenty-four lines each, and contains the Gospels except Matt. i. 1–xi. 16, John xvii. 15–xviii. 9, xx. 23–xxi. 8, Luke ix. 45–x. 20, xi. 45–xii. 6 (and some other parts lost through slighter mutilation) on its 192 surviving leaves.

q. Codex latinus Monacensis 6224, formerly of the abbey of Freising in Bavaria, was written by a scribe Valerianus in Italy [1] in the seventh century in a half-uncial hand, the characters of which are large and clumsy. It contains on 251 leaves, with double columns (containing twenty lines each), the four Gospels, with the exception of Matt. iii. 15–iv. 23, v. 25–vi. 4, vi. 28–vii. 8; John x. 11–xii. 38, xxi. 8-20; Luke xxiii. 23-35, xxiv. 11-39; Mark i. 7-21, xv. 5-36. When complete the manuscript must have contained 273 leaves. The special interest of *q* to the textual critic arises from the fact that, though it be an Old-Latin manuscript of the European class, it presupposes not infrequently a different Greek text from that which underlies the other Old-Latin manuscripts, whether 'African' or European. In its vocabulary *q* is close to the average type of European text, that which we find in *b*, but in its underlying text it frequently differs. The character of this MS. is, then, best explained by the theory that it is an European text (like *b*) which has been modified according to a Greek MS. with an up-to-date text.[2]

f. The MS. known as *f*, at Brescia, a MS. on purple-stained vellum with silver writing, may be mentioned here, though it is not an Old-Latin European MS. It was written in the sixth century, and contains all the Gospels except Mark xii. 5–xiii. 32, xiv. 70–xvi. 20. There can be no doubt that it represents the Latin side of a bilingual codex, which had Gothic in one column and Latin in the other, and it does not appear impossible that such a Gospel codex belonged to a recension made by St. Jerome's

[1] Traube, *Nomina Sacra*, p. 190. It may have been written at Bobbio.
[2] In addition to White's edition (*Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, No. iii.), cf. De Bruyne in the *Revue Bénédictine*, xxviii. (1911), pp. 75-80.

correspondents Sunnias and Fretelas [1] early in the fifth century. A fifth-century fragment of such a bilingual codex was found a year or two ago near the ancient Antinoe in Egypt, and is now at Giessen, the Gothic occupying the place of honour on the left. The two authorities *f* and *giess* agree very closely. Such copies were in use in the Gothic kingdom in North Italy, and Brescia was a great city of this kingdom. The construction of this type of text appears to have been carried out on this wise. An Old-Latin MS. was taken and partly corrected to the Vulgate: it was then altered to suit the readings and renderings of the Gothic.[2] This is a much better way of accounting for the fact that the MS. *f* is for ninety per cent. of its text identical with the Vulgate, than to conclude with Bishop Wordsworth and Professor White that *f* represents the type of text used by Jerome as the basis of the Vulgate in the Gospels.

European MSS. of Acts

d and *e* are the Latin sides of D (*Codex Bezae*) and E (*Codex Laudianus*), described in the last chapter.

gig. The manuscript styled *gigas* (from its great size) was written in Bohemia in the thirteenth century, but represents a fourth-century text, as is clear from the fact that this is exactly the type used by Lucifer of Cagliari (in Sardinia) († 370-1),[3] 'Ambrosiaster' (resident in Rome) (*flor.* 375),[4] and Niceta of Remesiana (in Dacia) (*flor.* 400).[5] Moreover, Jerome himself cites this type of text, on occasion, at least,[6] though he certainly did not use it as the basis of the Vulgate.[7]

[1] A long letter replying to textual questions touching the Psalms, addressed by these Goths, is Hier. *Epist.* cvi. (403 A.D.).

[2] Burkitt, *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. i. p. 131. For the origin and character of the Gothic, see below, p. 69 f.

[3] *Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi Latine* (ed. Wordsworth and White), ii. p. ix.

[4] Souter, *A Study of Ambrosiaster*, p. 207.

[5] Burkitt *ap.* Burn, *Niceta of Remesiana*, pp. cl-cliii.

[6] Cf. Epist. XLI. i. § 2 (p. 312 Hilberg). Vallarsi dates the letter 384.

[7] Cf. Wordsworth-White, *loc. cit.*

p. A small manuscript of the New Testament (Paris, 321), written in North Spain or South France early in the thirteenth century, and formerly preserved at Perpignan, contains a text of Acts which is Old-Latin from i. 1-xiii. 5, and from xxviii. 16-31, while the rest of the book is Vulgate.[1] The Old-Latin part has points of contact with the quotations in the homilies of Gregory of Elvira (saec. iv.): the fact that Augustine's readings often agree with this and other 'Spanish' texts, where Augustine's special type *h* (see above) is not extant, suggests that the Spanish texts are a revision of the 'African,' which is *a priori* probable.

European MSS. of the Pauline Epistles

d (otherwise d_2 or d^{paul}) represents the Latin side of the *Codex Claromontanus* (D), previously described. The Latin is not an exact translation of its accompanying Greek, but, except where it has been harmonised with the Vulgate in the longest epistles, represents exactly the text used by Lucifer of Cagliari (in Sardinia) († 371).[2]

g is the Latin side of a bilingual related to D and known as G (*Codex Boernerianus*, of the end of the ninth century, at Dresden). It has many alternative interlinear readings, one of the two being Vulgate. The Old-Latin readings probably represent a fourth-century text, as they not infrequently agree with the text of the Pauline Epistles contained in the commentary by the 'Ambrosiaster,' who flourished in Rome about 375.

European MSS. of the Catholic Epistles

ff. This MS. contains the Epistle of James alone of the Catholic Epistles. First in the extensive Benedictine library at Corbie, near Amiens, it was transferred with many other books to the sister house of St. Germain des

[1] With certain traces of Old-Latin here and there: cf. Buchanan's edition in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. xii. (1910-11), pp. 497-534.

[2] Souter, *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. vi. (1904-5), pp. 240 ff., following Burkitt, *Ency. Bibl.*, vol. iv. p. 4996.

Prés, Paris, and during the troublous times of the Revolution it was taken with a considerable selection of other St. Germain MSS. to St. Petersburg, where it now is. The MS. was written in the ninth or tenth century,[1] but it represents a much older text, possibly as old as the third century. It has some readings unique (almost freakish) in their character: for example, in chap. ii. 25 it has *exploratores ex XII tribus filiorum Israhel*, the last five words being found nowhere else. But on occasion it is in solitary agreement with the Greek MS. B, and in such places there is a strong probability that the reading is right, as there is no general kinship between the two texts. The MS. has the remarkable colophon, 'Here ends the Epistle of James the son of Zebedee,' whereas, of course, if the Epistle is apostolic at all, it can hardly belong to any other than James, the brother of the Lord (Gal. i. 19). One reading in this MS. is shared by a quotation in Chromatius of Aquileia († about 407), but this is too slender a basis on which to define the locality of its use. It would appear, like the following not unrelated MS., to represent a degenerate type of 'African' text, though we have not felt at liberty to class it definitely with the African texts.

m. This symbol is used, not to indicate a MS. of one particular book or group of books of Scripture, but to represent a work called 'Speculum' (mirror for conduct), wrongly attributed in manuscripts to St. Augustine.[2] This book consists of many verses of Scripture arranged topically, and it might have been introduced earlier, but for the fact that its text in the Catholic Epistles is more interesting than it is elsewhere: for there it agrees almost *ad litteram* with the quotations of Priscillian, the first person put to death by the Church († 385). For instance, James, chap. v. 1-3 (*m*)=Priscillian, ed. Schepss, p. 17, ll. 9-14. Before Schepss had discovered the tractates of Priscillian, Dr.

[1] The late Dr. Traube dated it ninth, Dr. Holder (Karlsruhe) dates it tenth. Cf. also A. Staerk, *Les Manuscrits Latins de Saint-Pétersbourg* (St. Petersburg, 1910), vol. ii. Plate LIX.

[2] There is also a genuine Speculum, prepared by Augustine and issued after his death, but in that work the quotations are in the Vulgate text.

Sanday had called this type of text degenerate African. We may now, therefore, conclude that Spain got some, at least, of its biblical texts from Africa.

European MS. of the Apocalypse

gig. The same MS. which is described above as containing an Old-Latin text of Acts, contains also an Old-Latin text of the Apocalypse. It is, however, extremely close to the Vulgate, and we must either conclude that Jerome's revision in the Apocalypse was the most perfunctory of all, or that the *gigas* MS. has here become seriously contaminated with the Vulgate, and has thus lost many of the original characteristics of its type. The former view is probably to be preferred. As to the locality where this type was in use, perhaps we can infer, from the fact that the text gives the remarkable rendering *aeramento turino* (incense-copper) for χαλκολιβάνῳ in chap. ii. 18—shared with Priscillian of Spain and 'Ambrosiaster,' who seems to have had Spanish connexions,[1] alone among ancient writers, so far as I know—that this kind of text was current in Spain. If it be the type used by Jerome in the Apocalypse, however, it was presumably known also in Italy.

This list may serve to give some idea of the character of the more important surviving documents of the Old-Latin versions of the New Testament books.

§ 2. Latin ('Vulgate')

Chronologically the Vulgate,[2] so called since the early Middle Ages, should give place to some other versions, but it is convenient to consider it at this point. It was not a fresh translation from the Greek, but a revision of existing Latin texts (or perhaps of one text only for each book

[1] See my edition of Pseudo-Augustini *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti CXXVII.* (Vindob. 1908), pp. xxii, xxiv.

[2] Jerome himself uses *vulgata*, etc., to indicate the most prevalent form of Latin text in his own time, in the case of any part of the Bible with which he happens at the time to be dealing.

or group of books in the New Testament), in the way of correcting mistranslations, substituting occasionally as foundation better Greek MSS. than those at the back of the Old-Latin, and purifying the Latinity to a more cultured standard. It owes its origin to Damasus, Bishop of Rome from 366 to 384. This prelate, whose wide interests made his episcopate one of the most notable, was moved by the bewildering variety of texts existing over the Latin-speaking world to desire a revision, which should be superior in character to any existing Latin translation, and should eventually supersede them all. He therefore commissioned his secretary, Eusebius Sofronius Hieronymus, known to us as St. Jerome, to undertake this revision. Jerome probably undertook it against his will,[1] but he was already ambitious to succeed Damasus, and no doubt considered it advisable to please his chief in all things.

It is only in the case of the Gospels that we learn anything of his work from himself. In a prefatory letter of surpassing interest, addressed to Damasus in the year 383, he tells us the circumstances of the publication. Damasus' chief purpose was that the Latin should be revised according to the 'true Greek text,' the judge of what this true text was to be Jerome himself. Jerome, mindful of the strong opposition which his work was sure to arouse, made as little change as possible. He altered the Western order of the Gospels to that familiar to us, and regular in Greek MSS., and he removed mistakes occurring in the Latin copies by comparing them with 'old' Greek copies. But he confined the corrections to such as affected the sense, leaving the rest of the text as it was. At least so he says, but there can be no doubt that the able pupil of the great grammarian Donatus improved the style also here and there. He also equipped the Gospels with the Eusebian 'Canons,' which he had found in Greek copies. These canons enabled one to see at a glance in how many Gospels a particular section was

[1] He uses the word *cogis* of Damasus' commission to him.

to be found. Sensible, also, of the harmonisation which had taken place between different Gospels, especially in Western MSS., he endeavoured to correct this defect by restoring the *ipsissima verba* of each Evangelist.

The question what type of text he chose as the basis of his revision, assuming that he used only one type, is answered in different ways by different critics. Hort, Wordsworth, and their collaborators were of opinion that the type chosen was that of *Codex Brixianus* (*f*) above described. This MS. is ninety per cent. the same as the Vulgate, and in the remaining ten per cent. of the Gospels the Vulgate represents a nearer approach to the readings of Greek MSS. like ℵ and B. But we prefer, with Burkitt, to explain the almost unique character of *f* as above, and to consider that the type of text used by St. Jerome was a real Old-Latin type, such a MS. as *b*, with the qualification that in Luke it may have been a MS. almost identical with *a*. (This last suggestion, which is my own, is due to the fact that St. Jerome is convicted of using a text practically identical with *a* in a very long quotation of Luke, chap. xv. 11-52, in a letter addressed to Damasus himself in the very year in which the Vulgate was issued.[1]) In that case Jerome will have used Greek MSS. of the Syrian (Antiochian) type as well as of the Alexandrian. His work would thus deserve the title *novum opus*.

One or two examples of Jerome's method of working may be given, first in the matter of reading, the more important, and then in rendering. All the Old-Latin authorities (except *f* and *q*[2]) omit *porro unum est necessarium* (ἑνὸς δέ ἐστιν χρεία) in Luke x. 42, but Jerome has inserted them from a Greek MS. (or Greek MSS.) of his own time.[3] Again, in Luke xxiv. 36, the words 'Peace be unto you' (εἰρήνη ὑμῖν) are absent from all unrevised Old-Latin texts, but are found in the Vulgate: our oldest Greek

[1] Epist. 21. See *Journal of Theological Studies*, xii. (1910-11), pp. 583-92, and above, p. 41.

[2] Where the wording differs from the Vulgate (cf. Burkitt in *J. T. S.*, xi. [1909-10], p. 263).

[3] Our oldest Greek MSS. to show this reading are A and C*.

authority for them is ℵ.[1] In matters of rendering some words are really test words. *Caerimonia*, probably because of its pagan flavour, is absent from all Old-Latin texts, but it is freely employed in the Vulgate. *Porro* is never found in any Old-Latin text, but is used in the Vulgate not infrequently as a rendering of δέ, where the Old-Latin employed *autem*. *Fores* is very rare in Old-Latin biblical texts, which prefer *ostia* or *ianuae* as a rendering of θύραι.[2] *Romphaea* has been left by Jerome once in the Apocalypse (ii. 12), but he has removed this Old-Latin rendering everywhere else in the Bible.

These instances are for the most part concerned with the Gospels. In the case of Acts Wordsworth and White have not been able to identify any Old-Latin text so close to the Vulgate as to deserve to be considered its basis, but they have shown that Jerome had a Greek MS. not unrelated to ℵ and B which he used in the course of his revision. In the Pauline Epistles he may have employed as the basis of his work the text which is used by 'Ambrosiaster' as the foundation of his commentary on the Epistles.[3] In the Apocalypse there can be little doubt that MS. *gigas* represents the type employed, if it be really Old-Latin throughout.[4]

The after-history of the Vulgate is interesting, and is parallel to the history of the reception of new English versions in modern times. No doubt it was adopted in the church of Rome from the first, but it was not to be expected that Damasus' successors would be so interested in it as to maintain it in a special position. As a matter of fact, we know that even in Pope Gregory's time (the second half of the sixth century) the Jerome revision and the Old-Latin were employed in the church of Rome indiscriminately. After about 398 Augustine employed the Gospel part in the church of Hippo Regius, of which he was bishop, and in all his works after that date long

[1] For other examples see Burkitt in *J. T. S.*, xi. (1909-10), pp. 450 ff.
[2] These three instances are borrowed from Burkitt, *op. cit.*, pp. 262, 454.
[3] A. Souter, *A Study of Ambrosiaster*, pp. 212-57, especially p. 214.
[4] See above, p. 47.

quotations are cited from the Vulgate.[1] About 409 Pelagius in Rome used the Vulgate text as the basis of his commentary on these Epistles.[2] But Old-Latin texts continued to be employed almost everywhere. For example, Augustine continued to use Old-Latin copies for the rest of the New Testament outside the Gospels. Primasius of Hadrumetum, in Africa, even in the sixth century employed a very old African type of text for his comments on the Apocalypse. His later contemporary, Cassiodorus, in South Italy, based his *Complexiones* on Old-Latin texts of Acts, Catholic Epistles, Pauline Epistles, and Apocalypse, though he had a complete Vulgate Bible in his possession. Such instances might be greatly multiplied. When we have critical texts of all the post-Vulgate Christian writers, it will be possible to write a very interesting book on the fortunes of Old-Latin and Vulgate texts in the early Middle Ages. In fact, the supremacy of the Vulgate was not assured till the ninth century, and it was not till the Council of Trent (1546) that the Vulgate became the standard for the Roman Catholic Church as a whole.

This situation is reflected in our MSS. The familiarity the scribes possessed with Old-Latin texts caused endless contamination in Vulgate MSS., and successive attempts were made to revise it into a state corresponding more or less to its primitive purity. The late Samuel Berger, a French Protestant, wrote learnedly and illuminatively on these.[3] About the end of the eighth century Alcuin of York was commissioned by Charlemagne to make a revision for the use of his kingdom. This he completed in the first year of the ninth century by the help of good MSS. from Northumbria. His contemporary Theodulf of Orléans revised the text from Spanish MSS. The work done in the University of Paris in the thirteenth century resulted in a purification of the text, which became widely known through the earliest printed editions. It was in that

[1] Burkitt, *Old Latin and the Itala*, pp. 72 ff., etc., following and amplifying the conclusions of the eighteenth-century expert Dom Sabatier.
[2] A. Souter, *The Commentary of Pelagius*, etc. (London, 1907), pp. 17 f.
[3] *Histoire de la Vulgate*, etc. (Paris, 1893).

century that Stephen Langton, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, divided the text into the chapters which we now use. The earliest important effort of the printing-press is the forty-two line Bible (double columns) which Johannes Gutenberg printed at Mainz about 1450 to 1455. The editions most interesting to the Roman Catholic appeared—that of Pope Sixtus v. in 1590, and that of Pope Clement VIII. in 1592, which superseded the former. This last is the standard Roman Catholic text, which is not nearly in the state in which it left the hands of St. Jerome, but the differences are mostly of a trifling character, textual, and not seriously affecting dogma. The present Pope Pius X. appointed a Commission of Benedictines in 1908 to undertake a fresh edition, under the presidency of Abbot Gasquet, Superior of the English Congregation. This work is proceeding on a vast scale and on thoroughly scientific principles.

The question of the identification of Vulgate MSS., and the other question of the estimation of their relative values, are both difficult to answer. The presence of Jerome's prefatory letter and the Eusebian Canons and Sections serves as a sufficient means of identification of Gospel MSS., but we have no such helps to the identification of manuscripts of the other parts of the New Testament. For these no Hieronymian prologues are extant, and indeed it is rather a curious fact that in Gospel MSS. of the Vulgate we generally find Priscillian's prologues, and in MSS. of the Pauline Epistles in the Vulgate we are provided with Marcionite prologues and chapter headings, while in some MSS. of the Vulgate Acts the prologues are Donatist. The occurrence of these extraneous growths on the Catholic work of Jerome is one of the oddest things in literary history. But their presence does not serve to stamp a MS. as Vulgate, as they are in all cases Old-Latin apparatus, which it was found convenient to transfer to Vulgate MSS. In the Gospels a MS. is Vulgate in proportion to its lack of readings which we know definitely to be Old-Latin, but in other parts of the New Testament we do not possess

the standards of comparison to the same extent, and there will perhaps be much debate yet ere this matter is settled. The textual critic and the philologist will both have much to say. The existence of really mixed texts, neither wholly Old-Latin nor wholly Vulgate, only serves to complicate the problem.

What are esteemed to be the best MSS. of the Vulgate Gospels, containing the text as nearly as possible in the form in which Jerome issued it, are connected with South Italy and Northumbria. One, a complete manuscript of the New Testament, written about 545 for Bishop Victor of Capua, contains the Gospels in the Vulgate text, but arranged in the form of Tatian's Diatessaron. This manuscript was brought from Italy to the north of England either by Benedict Biscop, founder of the Abbey of St. Paul, Jarrow-on-Tyne (681 or 682), or by Ceolfrid, whom he appointed Abbot of the monastery. It was afterwards given to Boniface along with the 'Laudian' Acts, and contains some notes by his hand. He deposited it at Fulda in Germany, where it still is. The second manuscript was itself either written at Jarrow or Wearmouth to the order of Abbot Ceolfrid. It is one of three 'Pandects,' that is, complete Bibles, which he ordered to be written. He designed two of them for these monasteries respectively. But the third was to be given to the Holy Father himself. In 715 Ceolfrid started with this manuscript, but died at Langres, France, on his way to Rome. The manuscript, however, was duly conveyed to Rome by Ceolfrid's companions, and presented to the Pope. It later found its way to the monastery of Monte Amiata (whence its name, *Amiatinus*), and thence to Florence, Laurentian Library, whose greatest treasure it is, being one of the largest MSS. in the world. The two copies made for Wearmouth and Jarrow have perished in whole or in part.[1]

Clearly all three were made from an original which had been brought from Italy, and indeed 'Amiatinus' was

[1] See C. H. Turner's *Iter Dunelmense* in *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. x. (1908-9), pp. 529-44.

written by an Italian scribe, probably out of compliment to a Pope, who would have found 'insular' script offensive and unreadable. The original of the three we know, too, to have been connected with no less a person than Cassiodorus, of Vivarium, South Italy, the retired Prime Minister of Theodoric, for the MS. contains prefatory matter which is indisputably Cassiodorian. Other MSS. of English provenance preserve the same Gospel text entirely or partially.

The ground for the pre-eminence assigned to these MSS. in the Gospels—for elsewhere it would seem that their text may not be so good—is the absence of specifically Old-Latin readings. The text of Wordsworth and White is based principally on the consensus of these MSS., though they have collated many others. Improvement of their edition of the Gospels is only possible here and there, on the basis of collation of very early copies overlooked by them, combined with quotations in critically edited writings of the two centuries succeeding the original issue of the Vulgate by St. Jerome. The publication early in 1912 of a tentative critical text of the entire Vulgate New Testament by Professor White, under the joint auspices of the Clarendon Press and the British and Foreign Bible Society, is a notable event.

SYRIAC VERSIONS

§ 1. Tatian's Diatessaron

The early history of Syriac versions is a subject about which experts have differed considerably, and one who is no expert will refrain from any foolish attempt to point the right way. The view of Professor Burkitt will be adopted here, as that which seems to the outsider to be the more rational—namely, that the four Gospels were earlier known to the Assyrian Church as interwoven to form a connected narrative (διὰ τεσσάρων) than as four separate books. This is suggested by the title of the four

separate Gospels when they first emerge in the history of the Church of the Assyrians, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshê*, 'The Gospel of the Separated Ones.' No one would be likely to speak of our four Gospels in that way who had not been earlier accustomed to use them in the combined form.

Tatian, an Assyrian Christian, face to face with the fact that the Synoptic Gospels contain so much that is represented twice and three times over, conceived the idea of combining all that was contained in the four Gospels, without repeating any part common to two or more, into one connected narrative. He therefore took a Greek text of the Gospels of a type current during the third quarter of the second century in Rome, where he was resident at the time, and rearranged it, as we should say, with scissors and paste. Whether the resulting compilation was ever translated into Latin direct we cannot say. Certainly Victor of Capua, as we have seen in the last section, arranged the Gospels in the Vulgate text 'diatessarically,' but he may have done this direct from Tatian's Greek, and not through the medium of a Latin translation. This work of Victor has, in the circumstances, only got a value as to Tatian's arrangement, not at all as to his text.

Tatian himself, probably on his return to his native country, about 170, translated the resulting Greek compilation into Syriac, the language of the Euphrates valley, and this translation became the regular version in the use of the churches of Edessa and other places in that country. The Syriac language was akin to, but not identical with, the Aramaic spoken by our Lord. Tatian's Syriac Diatessaron remained in use till the end of the fourth century and even the early part of the fifth. It is regularly quoted by Syriac Fathers—for example, by the greatest of them all, St. Ephraim, who died in 373. It is, in fact, from the commentary which St. Ephraim wrote on the Diatessaron that we recover almost all the reliable part of the text of Tatian's work that has survived, for the original in its original form has perished. It was at some date in the

fifth century or later brought into textual harmony with the Peshitta (see below), but even this form has perished. All that we have are two manuscripts of an Arabic translation, made by a monk in the eleventh century, of a MS. of this 'Peshittised' version. Here, again, the arrangement is preserved, as in Victor, but hardly any traces of the original text. It may be safely said that the original Greek of Tatian's book is a more desirable possession for the textual critic of the Gospels than almost anything else yet undiscovered: the Syriac in its original form would be only less valuable.

The type of text used as the basis of the Diatessaron was what we should call 'Western,' but it is rather closer to the geographically Western, the 'Western' of *Codex Bezae* and the European Old-Latin, than it is to the text behind the Old-Syriac version, which falls to be considered next. For instance, the Diatessaron contained a reference to the great light at the baptism (Matt. iii. 16), also found in Justin and two European Old-Latin MSS., but not in the Old-Syriac. In some cases the Diatessaron stands alone: for example, in Matt. xvii. 26, it, along with Greek minuscule MS. 713 of the twelfth or thirteenth century, only has the interpolation after *υἱοί*: 'Simon said to him, "Yea!" Jesus said to him, "Give thou also to him as a stranger."' But there are readings (especially renderings) common to the Diatessaron and the Old-Syriac not all of equal significance. Both are 'Western' texts, and some relationship between the two is to be expected. In certain cases an influence of the one upon the other seems probable, and is just what one would anticipate.

Hermann von Soden has assigned a very important place to the Diatessaron. He argues that every departure from his supposed *I-H-K* text that is found at an earlier date than the constitution of that text, is due to the influence of the Diatessaron. That harmonising, conscious or unconscious, played a great part in ancient as in modern citations, cannot be disputed. But it is impossible to prove so great an influence of the Diatessaron, seeing that

its original form has disappeared. Also, if it had had such powerful influence as he says, it is hardly probable that it should have left hardly any trace in the Graeco-Roman world ; [1] the fact that the author was a heretic is not a sufficient reason for its disappearance.

§ 2. The Old-Syriac

But if the Assyrian Church regularly read the Gospels in a Diatessaron, there was nevertheless some interest in them in separate form as originally written, at least among scholars. Two manuscripts of a translation different from any of the others have come down to us. There is by no means perfect agreement between their texts, but they are nevertheless manuscripts of one version, which is now known as the Old-Syriac, but was in the days when it was used known as the *Evangelion da-Mepharreshê*, 'The Gospel of the Separated Ones,'—in other words, the separated Gospels. The older MS. is a palimpsest, of which the original writing, the text of the Gospels in Syriac, was written in the fourth century probably. The MS., preserved in the Monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai, was there discovered in 1892 by Mrs. Lewis of Cambridge, England, who was then in the company of her sister, Mrs. Gibson. It is thus known as the 'Sinaitic' or the 'Lewis' Syriac. Since then it has been repeatedly photographed, transcribed, and examined (twice by the help of a re-agent). All, or almost all, that is humanly possible has now been done to make its readings accessible to the world. The upper writing of the palimpsest belongs to A.D. 778, and the task of reading the original writing is one of excessive difficulty at times. The manuscript now contains Matthew i. 1–vi. 10, viii. 3–xvi. 15, xvii. 11–xx. 24, xxi. 20–xxviii. 7 ; Mark i. 12-44, ii. 21–iv. 17, iv. 41–v. 26 ; vi. 5–Luke i. 16, i. 38–v. 28, vi. 12–end ; John i. 25-47, ii. 16–iv. 37, v. 6-25, v. 46–xviii. 31, xix. 40–xxi. 25.

[1] There is some affinity between the Diatessaron and the Old-Latin MS. *g* (Matthew).

The other manuscript, written later, probably in the first half of the fifth century, was discovered in the great library of the Convent of St. Mary the Mother of God in the Natron valley, west of Cairo. All but three leaves at Berlin is preserved in the British Museum, like so many other books from the same library, acquired in 1842 and 1847. In its original state the manuscript contained the Gospels in the unusual order Matthew, Mark, John, Luke: of these it now contains only Matthew i. 1–viii. 22, x. 32–xxiii. 25; Mark xvi. 17-20; John i. 1-42, iii. 5–viii. 19, xiv. 10-12, 15-19, 21-24, 26-29; Luke ii. 48–iii. 16, vii. 33–xvi. 12, xvii. 1–xxiv. 24. A comparison of the ground covered by each MS. shows that, even if we combine the two MSS., we do not possess the Gospels quite complete. Sometimes, also, only one MS. is available. Where the two are available, a comparative study is really helpful. We see, for instance, that the Sinaitic MS. must represent an earlier form of the version, at least for the most part, than the Curetonian does. The Sinaitic, for example, is, like the oldest Greek uncials, without any ending to Mark, but the Curetonian exhibits the longer ending. Instances of the same kind might be multiplied, whereas instances of the contrary are rare.

A theory is wanted both to explain the origin of this version and the differences between its two representatives. Burkitt has conjectured that in its original form the version was the work of Palut, the third Bishop of Edessa, and that it was prepared under the auspices of Serapion, Bishop of Syrian Antioch, about the year 200. The Greek text from which the translation was made was, therefore, the text in use at Antioch at that date—a text otherwise practically unrepresented in our extant authorities, at least so far as we know. The translator was influenced both by the Peshitta Old Testament and by the Diatessaron in some of his renderings and readings. The Antioch text, therefore, 'Western' in character, if not Western geographically, has suffered in the process of translation some alterations which bring it on occasion into closer conformity

with another, though kindred, type—namely, the geographically Western type. The differences between the Curetonian and Sinaitic types are easily explained. The Curetonian type represents a partial revision according to Greek MSS. of the later (fourth century) kind. Both MSS. seem also to have been at times altered to agreement with the Diatessaron by scribes accustomed to its language.

Examples of the phenomena just indicated are: in Matthew iv. 6 and Luke iv. 11 'arms' instead of 'hands' is due to the influence of the Peshitta Old Testament (Psalm xci. 12). The Old-Syriac and the Diatessaron agree in rendering οὐκ ἤθελεν in Luke xviii. 13 as 'was not daring,' as they do in rendering σάρξ (John i. 14) by 'a body,' and ἐν ἡμῖν (same verse) by 'in our nature'; both also have 'Lo' for οἶδα ὅτι in John iv. 25. Proof that the Sinaitic MS. contains the version in a more primitive form than the Curetonian is to be seen in the fact that the former omits the 'Father, forgive them' passage in Luke xxiii. 34 with the oldest Greek MSS., while the latter joins the multitude of Greek MSS. in inserting it at that place. The state of the evidence in the Lord's Prayer points the same way, as does the text of Luke x. 41.

Hitherto nothing has been said of the Old-Syriac version of other parts of the New Testament, and indeed there is not much to say. The older Assyrian Church possessed the Epistles of Paul (including the spurious Epistle to the Corinthians), and also the three Catholic Epistles, First John, First Peter, and James, but no more of the New Testament. We know hardly anything of the text of the Epistles of Paul, little more than we can get from Ephraim's Syriac commentary, which has survived in an Armenian translation, and a few citations from his contemporary Aphraates. There was certainly some kinship between the text used by Ephraim and that used by the heretic Marcion. This need not surprise us. Tatian and Marcion were in Rome about the same time. Just as Tatian used a Western text of the Gospels as the basis of his Diatessaron, so must Marcion also have used a Western text as the basis of his

recension of St. Paul's Epistles. Doubtless Tatian brought the Epistles of Paul to Assyria, and may have translated an early Western text of them for the benefit of his compatriots. It may have been Marcion's edition which was translated in the first instance, and afterwards amplified. Of this text we would gladly know more, but only Armenian experts can give us this, and, so far as I know, they have not yet done so with the desirable fulness.

§ 3. The Peshitta (Simple, Vulgate) Version

The third of the Syriac versions, the Vulgate of the Assyrian Church, was, like the Latin Vulgate, a revision, not a fresh translation. Rabbula, Bishop of Edessa from 411 to 435, ordered that the Old-Syriac version should be revised in accordance with up-to-date Greek MSS. Thus the Old-Syriac was thoroughly revised textually [1] to bring it into accord with manuscripts which were two centuries later than those from which it had been made, and were quite different in type. Constantinople was now the centre of the Church in the East, and there an ecclesiastical text was in use which we find cited in the writings of the great patriarch St. Chrysostom, done to death in 407. Such an MS. as he might have used was carefully compared with the Old-Syriac version of the Gospels, and the latter was carefully altered, generally in the direction of expansion, to agree with the Greek MS. Thus it happens that the Peshitta Syriac rarely witnesses to anything different from what we find in the great bulk of Greek manuscripts. The version has remained the standard through all the later divisions of the Assyrian Church. It did not contain Second or Third John, Second Peter, Jude, or the Apocalypse.

This view, first expounded by Burkitt, is held now by nearly all Syriac scholars, and seems to those without to be much more rational than the older view.[2] The older

[1] But old translations remain: ἀποστεῖλαι (Luke iv. 18) is still translated 'confirm (strengthen).'

[2] Cf. Hermann von Soden, *Die Schriften des N. T.*, u.s.w., Bd. i. pp. 1459 f.

Syriac scholars considered the Peshitta to be a second-century production, and, as its close relationship to the bulk of Greek MSS. was evident, the defenders of the Constantinopolitan ecclesiastical text could point to this second-century version as evidence that the type of text they defended was as old as any known. The Peshitta was, in fact, 'the sheet-anchor,' as Dr. Sanday happily put it, of the older hypothesis. Now that this anchor has been shown to be but decaying wood after all, and incapable of holding, the Peshitta can be left to perform a part hardly less interesting, if not so important, as used to be claimed for it.

§ 4. The Philoxenian Version

The Assyrian Church was slow to rest content with its achievements in the way of translation. Standard and official as the Peshitta always remained, further efforts were employed on the New Testament. In the year 506 Xenaia (Philoxenus), Bishop of Mabug (Hierapolis),[1] superintended a more exactly literal translation of the New Testament made by his χωρεπίσκοπος, Polycarp. Of this translation in its original form only the books lacking in the Peshitta Canon, namely, Second and Third John, Second Peter, Jude, and the Apocalypse, survive. The Greek manuscripts from which the translation was made were of considerable textual purity. For instance, what is probably the correct reading in Jude, verses 22-23, namely, καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζετε, διακρινομένους δὲ ἐλεᾶτε, with ἐν φόβῳ κ.τ.λ. following as in other texts, is preserved only in this version, and in Clement of Alexandria (date about 220) and Jerome (about 400).

§ 5. The Harclean Revision

But, though this Philoxenian version has for the most part perished, it exists almost complete in a revision made

[1] Now Menbidsh on the Euphrates.

by Thomas of Harkel (Heraclea) on the basis of two or three accurate Greek manuscripts, in the year 616-17, at Alexandria. The purpose of this revision was to make the accurate Philoxenian version more literal still. The result is such as to do violence to the Syriac language. But if this fact made it unreadable before congregations, it makes it all the more useful to the textual critic who seeks to get below it to the underlying Greek. Its accuracy seldom leaves the original Greek in doubt.

A new feature of the translation is that it was equipped with signs, and with marginal notes containing the readings of the manuscripts, Syriac and Greek, used by the translator. These notes show that manuscripts diverging from the normal in text were still to be found in Alexandria at the beginning of the seventh century. The Harclean revision is particularly interesting in the Book of Acts, where marginal variations from the text, both Syriac and Greek, are in remarkable agreement with the Graeco-Latin *Codex Bezae* (saec. v.-vi.) and three Greek cursives known as 383 (saec. xiii.), 614 (saec. xiii. perhaps), and 1518 (saec. xv.). In fact, very frequently some or all of these authorities stand together against all others in attesting particular readings: compare, for instance, my note on Acts xvi. 39. This type of text is what we call 'Western.' A fresh critical edition of the Harclean revision of Acts is much wanted. In other books its text is more commonplace—more, in fact, what we should expect a seventh-century product to be.

§ 6. The Palestinian Version

The Palestinian version is written in a dialect of Syriac (nearer to the Aramaic spoken by our Lord than are the other forms of Syriac) spoken near Syrian Antioch, as well as on Sinai and in Egypt. No book of the New Testament exists complete in this version. We are dependent, in fact, on various manuscripts of a lectionary containing select extracts from the Bible. The Greek

manuscripts at the basis of the version were by no means commonplace. The version, for example, surprises us by preserving what is probably the right reading in Matthew xxvii. 17, 'Jesus Barabbas': this reading is attested by very few Greek MSS., but the Old-Syriac version also, the Armenian (no doubt through the Old-Syriac), Origen, and old MSS. known to Peter of (Syrian) Laodicea [1] (about 600) share it with the Palestinian Syriac.

[1] Perhaps Peter is here, as often elsewhere, simply copying Origen.

CHAPTER V

THE OLDER VERSIONS—*continued*

EGYPTIAN (COPTIC) VERSIONS, GOTHIC

Introductory

FROM the time of Alexander the Great, and perhaps from a still earlier date, cultivated persons in Egypt had been able to speak Greek. Alexandria almost from the first was destined to be a noted centre of Greek learning and books. The earlier Ptolemies were munificent patrons of Greek learning, and drew around them a succession of scholars and librarians distinguished enough, even though they failed to produce immortal works. The library or libraries of Alexandria were intended to contain the entire literature of Greece (in the widest sense) on papyrus rolls. In no part of the Greek world did Greek institutions of every sort take deeper root.

When Egypt became a Roman province after the battle of Actium (31 B.C.), it was treated by the Roman emperors in a different way from all the other provinces. Here alone did the emperor reign as king, as the successor of the Ptolemies. He sent a man of equestrian rank as *praefectus* to govern for him, and his jealousy was such that no senator was permitted to land in Egypt without special permission from the emperor. It was thus that the life of Egypt was for long lived apart from the rest of the empire. It was the greatest centre of the corn supply for Rome and Italy, and as such had to be guarded with especial care. Its peculiar position, separate from the rest of the empire, made it possible for conservative

institutions of every sort to flourish there, while the rest of the empire was progressing.

It was in this country, thickly populated with Jews, that the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament was begun in the third century B.C. Here some at least of the Old Testament Apocrypha were written. Alexandria was the scene of Philo the Jew's prolific literary activity. A good soil for Christianity had been prepared, and there can be no doubt that Christianity made rapid progress there. Not that our records are reliable. The churches of Egypt were isolated from the other churches in the way we have indicated. This was favourable to special development, and indeed we know that in some matters of government the churches of Egypt were different from all others. The peculiar position of Egypt, joined to its scholarly traditions, was also favourable to the better preservation of the New Testament text, at a time when it was being freely handled in the West. As we have seen, our most accurate documents come from there.

In contrast to the wide cultivation of the classes in which Christianity was sure to spread most easily, were the original Egyptians themselves, whom the Romans considered to be the most degraded of all their subjects. In fact, they corresponded in the Roman world to the Australian aborigines in our own time. For long no version of the New Testament books would be required in Egypt, because the entire reading public was Greek-speaking and reading. But when Christianity had worked its way down to the degraded strata of society, and had gradually lifted them higher and higher, eventually the stage was reached when versions in the native Egyptian dialects became necessary.

Of these dialects there were a number. Here we are concerned only with three, one of which itself is really a group. There were the Bohairic dialect, that spoken in the delta of the Nile, the Sahidic dialect spoken in Upper Egypt nearer the source of the Nile, and the group of dialects known as Fayyumic (Basmuric), spoken in the

district called the Fayyum. The special circumstances of each district would determine the date at which a translation would become necessary. In the northern part, where was Alexandria, the necessity did not arise till late, and Guidi, followed by Burkitt and Leipoldt, thinks that the Bohairic version, still the official version of the Coptic Church, was made in the sixth or seventh (or eighth) century. The Sahidic version, made for a region where the knowledge of Greek was not so widespread, was probably much earlier, third or fourth century.[1] Each of those versions appears to have been subjected to at least one revision, as the manuscripts in particular passages are divided in their support, some supporting older Greek MSS., others later Greek MSS. Knowledge of the fragments of New Testament texts preserved in the Fayyumic dialects is as yet the property only of the experts, and of them not much can yet be said.

§ 1. The Sahidic[2] Version

The Sahidic version of the New Testament must be restored from numerous fragments: hardly a single New Testament book exists complete in any MS.[3] The Rev. George W. Horner has recently published the Gospels in a critical recension, with apparatus, translation, and photographs, which far surpasses all previous efforts.[4] He has succeeded in presenting all the text of the Gospels except thirteen verses in Matthew, thirty-five in Mark, and three in Luke: of these fragmentary verses only fourteen are entirely absent. The text in each portion rarely

[1] Leipoldt, a brilliant Coptic scholar, dates the Sahidic version in the first half of the fourth century, and the Bohairic in the seventh or eighth century (*Geschichte des neutest. Kanons*, i. (Leipzig, 1907), pp. 81 f.).

[2] Formerly called Thebaic.

[3] This statement must be modified in the light of the discovery of complete MSS. of Matthew, Mark, John, fourteen Epistles of Paul, First and Second Peter, First, Second, and Third John, now in the possession of J. Pierpont Morgan (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, xxxi. [1912], p. 55). There is also a British Museum fourth-century MS. of Acts, recently published by Dr. Budge (*Coptic Biblical Texts in the British Museum* [London, 1911]).

[4] Clarendon Press, 3 vols., (March) 1911.

depends on one fragment only, and seldom on less than three: in two verses of John ix. there are actually seventeen authorities.[1] When one reflects that these fragments are seven hundred and fifty-one in number, and are the débris of about a dozen papyrus, and nearly a hundred and fifty parchment and paper books, the stupendous nature of Mr. Horner's labour will be realised. The fragments vary in date from the fourth century to the fourteenth, and they are not entirely homogeneous in textual character, though wonderfully so.

Nevertheless, the character of the Sahidic version, at least so far as the Gospels are concerned, is fairly clearly marked. Like its younger sister, the Bohairic, it is mainly Neutral in tendency—that is, it agrees habitually with the ℵ B type of text. Yet at the same time it shows very considerable agreement with D and the Old-Latin authorities, where these differ from ℵ and B. This latter agreement is less striking in Matthew and John than it is in Luke and Mark. The whole state of affairs could be explained by the supposition that the original Sahidic Gospels were translated from a manuscript Western in text and order of Gospels—such a manuscript, in fact, as Clement of Alexandria possessed.[2] This type could then have been carefully revised with the Neutral type in Matthew and John (the first and second Gospels in this set), and the third and fourth revised in a more perfunctory way.[3] A reviser's ardour often cools when he sees what a tedious work detailed revision is. Despite the frequent concurrences with D and the Old-Latin authorities, it is remarkable that there is hardly an instance where D and the Sahidic, or the Old-Latin and the Sahidic, stand together in making an addition to the text of all other authorities. Even the description of the stone at

[1] Horner's preface to vol. i. p. viii.

[2] It must be remembered that W, the Freer MS. from Egypt, despite late textual elements, still has the Gospels in the Western order.

[3] As a matter of fact, there is reason to suppose that John came before Matthew, and Mark before Luke, in the Sahidic 'Gospel'; but this does not affect our reasoning.

the tomb of Jesus in St. Luke appears in different words in each of the four Sahidic manuscripts available at that point, the wording in no case agreeing exactly with that of D or the Old-Latin MS. *c*, the only other authorities for the interpolation. An interesting Western reading, κεκαλυμμένη for καιομένη in Luke xxiv. 32, is unquestionably also the genuine Sahidic lection, as the testimony of six Sahidic MSS. extant at that point is unanimous. In Acts the text is said to be more distinctively Western.

The Sahidic version is of the utmost importance in any endeavour to sketch the earliest history of the New Testament text, for in itself it shows in special combination the 'Western' and 'Neutral' types. An ideal text could perhaps be constructed from these two types alone, if we possessed them in a state of perfect purity. If the character of the Sahidic as now accessible does not make the problem of the early history of the Greek text easier, it at least provides fresh material for the solution of that problem of a surpassingly interesting kind.

§ 2. The Bohairic[1] Version

The whole New Testament is preserved in the Bohairic version, the official version of the Coptic Church. In textual character it is not unrelated to the Sahidic, and certain MSS. of the Bohairic appear to have been actually influenced by Sahidic MSS. But this version differs in two ways from the Sahidic. It is on the whole closer to the Greek MSS. ℵ and B, and rarely shows Western characteristics. Again, while it supports ℵ and B consistently, it not infrequently, or at least this is true of certain MSS., supports the later Alexandrian type of text, of which L is the best representative. This latter fact suggests that the Bohairic translation is altogether a later production than the Sahidic. The MSS., also, are far from showing the consistency of the Sahidic MSS. It seems not improbable that the Bohairic version was sub-

[1] Sometimes called also Coptic, Memphitic.

jected to a revision not very long after its original appearance. The oldest MS. of the Bohairic, a Gospel lectionary,[1] sometimes presents an older type of reading than any other extant Bohairic manuscript.

§ 3. The Middle-Egyptian Versions

Of the Middle-Egyptian versions fragments in at least three dialects are preserved, but they are practically inaccessible to non-experts, and as yet do not cover much of the ground of the New Testament. A complete study of them will doubtless be undertaken when more fragments have come to hand. The symbol 'basm' in Tischendorf (=Basmuric) indicates a reading in one of the dialects of Middle Egypt. Some of these readings are striking enough, as, for example, in Hebrews ix. 2, where there is an interesting agreement with B in a remarkable reading.

§ 4. Gothic Version

Some of the Goths on the northern frontier of the Roman Empire became Christian before they became Roman, and in consequence their second Bishop Ulfilas (Wulfila), whose life stretched throughout the greater part of the fourth century, translated the Bible into the Gothic language. This translation has great interest as the oldest Teutonic literary monument. The translation of the New Testament was made from Greek MSS. such as Chrysostom used, of the official Constantinopolitan type. The version no longer exists in completeness. The most noted manuscript of it, the *Codex Argenteus*, now at Upsala, is written in silver letters on purple-stained vellum, and the writing was probably executed in North Italy in the sixth century. How it found its way into the valuable library of the monastery of Werden in Germany, where it was in the sixteenth century, is not known, but in the middle of the seventeenth century it reached Sweden as part of the booty

[1] Perhaps Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan's defective *codex* is still older (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, xxxi. [1912], p. 55).

taken in the Thirty Years' War, having been in the interim at Prague. The manuscript in its present state contains fragments of the four Gospels. A bilingual Gothico-Latin fragment of another, probably fifth century, Gospel MS. has been mentioned in the last chapter. Fragments of the Pauline Epistles have also come down to us, belonging to other MSS., one at Wolfenbüttel being Latino-Gothic and containing about forty verses of Romans. It is possible that a critical edition of the Gothic Bible was produced by Ulfilas's pupils Sunnias and Fretelas in 405. Certainly, where two authorities are available for comparison, they do not always precisely agree.

CHAPTER VI

SECONDARY VERSIONS

UNDER this head are included not only versions which are of secondary importance to the textual critic, but more especially those which were not made directly from the Greek, but through some intervening version. Even in modern times we are familiar with such secondary versions. Wycliffe's and all the other English versions before William Tindale's were translations of the Latin, and not made from the original tongues, Hebrew and Greek. Similarly the Western Church had to read the Old Testament in a translation of the Septuagint, until Jerome translated it from the Hebrew. Several versions of the New Testament existed in the early centuries of the Church, which are translations of other versions, and these we now propose to enumerate.

§ 1. ARMENIAN VERSIONS

The Armenian Church was the result of evangelisation by Assyrian Christians, and it was natural that the Armenians should get their biblical books from the Assyrians. The Gospels, Acts, and Pauline Epistles were translated into Armenian from the Old-Syriac version, either in the third or the fourth century, and an exact copy of this translation in the Gospels would be practically equivalent to a third manuscript of the Old-Syriac version. The Assyrian influence on the Armenian Church subsisted into the fifth century. In the year 433, however, two Armenians returning from the Synod of Ephesus obtained

a Greek Bible at Constantinople, and, after learning Greek at Alexandria, translated it into Armenian, or rather revised the existing Armenian version by reference to the Greek. At least so one tradition runs; but another records that St. Sahak performed this service about 406. The best edition of the version, based on twenty manuscripts, is that of Zohrab (1789), but this edition naturally does not satisfy the legitimate demands of modern biblical scholarship. The Armenian version, like the Old-Syriac, lacked Philemon, but had the apocryphal Third Corinthians.

The manuscripts show many divergences from one another. No manuscripts of the primitive form survive. The older readings probably represent elements belonging to the earliest form of the version from the Old-Syriac; while the others are due to the Constantinopolitan ecclesiastical Greek text behind the second form of the Armenian. For instance, one manuscript of the Armenian, like the older form of the Old-Syriac, is without any ending to Mark, but all the other known MSS. have the longer ending,[1] one attributing it to 'the presbyter Ariston.' This is generally considered to point to Aristion of Asia (*flor.* 110), a disciple of the Lord mentioned by Papias. There can be no doubt that the original Armenian version was without the ending. Much valuable information on the Armenian readings, due to an independent study of the version in the original, will be found in the apparatus to Mr. Horner's edition of the Sahidic version.

For one part of the New Testament, the Apocalypse, we possess, thanks to the scholarly labours of Dr. F. C. Conybeare, an up-to-date edition of both forms in which it has come down to us. He has shown that the Apocalypse was first translated into Armenian in the fifth century. As this book does not appear to have been translated into Syriac till the century after, this translation cannot have come from Syriac. It would be natural, therefore, to infer that it was made direct from Greek. But some curious phenomena about it seem to suggest that it was made

[1] Cf. also the case of Luke xxii. 43-4.

from Latin: the spelling *Zezabel* (ii. 20); the reading 'pains of a couch' (ii. 22) in one MS., compared with *luctum* of one Latin authority, confused with *lectum* (couch). In whatever way we explain such occurrences, the Old-Armenian is a valuable text, and in some cases it may alone preserve the original reading in the case of a book, the textual history of which is notoriously obscure and difficult: for example, it omits ὡς χιών in chap. i. verse 15. Its additions, however, such as 'with the daughters of the Gentiles' (chap. ii. 14) after πορνεῦσαι (cf. xiii. 5), may make one suspicious as to its omissions. I have been careful to record its interesting readings in my apparatus.

This Old-Armenian version of the Apocalypse was revised in the twelfth century, and in this later form it is officially recognised. The revision leaves a good many of the older characteristics untouched.

§ 2. Ethiopic (Abyssinian) Version

Scholars vary much in their opinions as to the date of origin of the Ethiopic version, some arguing for a date as early as the fifth century, while others attribute it to a date as late as the sixth or seventh. Gildemeister was of the latter opinion, and believed the version to have been translated from Syriac by Monophysite Assyrians who had converted the Abyssinians about 500 A.D. With this opinion Burkitt agrees, adding that it was the Old-Syriac, not the Peshitta, that was used. The version was certainly influenced later by Coptic or Arabic texts. The oldest manuscript is perhaps of the thirteenth century. According to some, at least, of those who know the Ethiopic version well, it is valueless for purposes of New Testament textual criticism. Ἀντικρύς in Acts xx. 15 is taken as a proper name. Certainly there are wide variations between the MSS., and in important places we generally find that some of them are ranged on each side.

§ 3. Georgian (Iberian) Version

This version was supposed by some to have been made from the Greek in the sixth century, but its characteristics, so far as they are known, rather suggest a close relationship with the Armenian, and point to considerable freedom in handling the sacred text. Drs. Conybeare and Burkitt are of opinion that it was made originally from a manuscript of the Old-Syriac text almost identical with that which the first Armenian translators used. This would at once explain its likeness to the Armenian. They also think that this original form of the version was revised and corrected throughout from the Greek text, in the time of St. Euthymius, says Conybeare.[1] In certain select parts of the Gospels he has exhibited points of contact between this version and D, the Sinaitic and Peshitta Syriac, and the Armenian. In Acts a manuscript of the twelfth or thirteenth century abounds in early Western readings, especially such as are found in D and E of the Greek.[2] A further connexion with the Armenian is postulated by some, for example Dr. T. Kluge, who decides that the Georgian version is later than the Armenian, but how much later he cannot say.[3]

§ 4. Arabic Versions

These come partly direct from the Greek, partly through Syriac, and partly through Coptic. Muhammad himself knew the Gospel story only orally. The oldest MS. goes no farther back than the eighth century: a ninth-century MS. contains certain of the Pauline Epistles in a text, which appears to have been translated from the Peshitta

[1] 'The Georgian Version of the N. T.' in *Zeitschrift für die neutest. Wissenschaft*, xi. (1910), 232-9, with photographs of pages of two MSS. (possibly of the twelfth and thirteenth century). Euthymius lived in the fifth century.

[2] The 'Old Georgian Version of Acts' in the same review, xii. (1911), 131-40, with three plates.

[3] In the same review, *Über das Alter der georgischen Übersetzung des Neuen Testamentes*, xi. (1910), 161-6.

Syriac. Interesting readings are occasionally to be found in Arabic; for example, the negative form of Matthew xviii. 20, a reading at least as old as the second century. Two revisions of the Arabic are reported to have taken place at Alexandria in the thirteenth century.

Such is a sketchy view of certain ancient versions. The meagreness of our knowledge with regard to certain of them is a call for workers in this field. It is most desirable that what Mr. Horner has done so admirably for the Bohairic and Sahidic should be done for the Armenian, Georgian, and other versions.

CHAPTER VII

PATRISTIC (AND OTHER EARLY) CITATIONS

§ 1. Greek Writers

Apostolic Fathers.—The quotations from or allusions to the New Testament in the Epistle of Barnabas, Didache, First Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, Shepherd of Hermas, and Second Clement were carefully collected and examined by a committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology. The results, which were published in 1905 in a volume entitled *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, have hardly any bearing on the choice between variants in passages of the New Testament. But, if one could be sure that First Clement i. 3 was an echo of the Epistle to Titus, chap ii. verse 5, the οἰκουργεῖν of the former would be a powerful support to the οἰκουργούς of the better MSS. (as against the οἰκουρούς of the inferior) in the latter.

Marcion, a native of Sinope in Pontus, active in Rome (140 and later). When he parted from the Church of Rome, he issued an Εὐαγγέλιον of his own which was that of St. Luke with excisions made in the interests of his excessive Paulinism. The text he used as the basis of this edition was of course old, and old of the Western type.[1] We find him in company with Latin witnesses, especially the European Old-Latin MSS., but not infrequently also with the Old-Syriac. He is never on the side of the great Greek uncials against both these versions.[2]

Marcion's canon of the Pauline Epistles deserves special

[1] Cf. Sanday, *The Gospels in the Second Century* (London, 1876), pp. 231 ff., 362 ff.; Zahn, *Gesch. des neutest. Kanons*, i. pp. 585-718; C. H. Turner in *Journal of Theological Studies*, x. (1908-9), pp. 179-82.

[2] Cf. below, pp. 122, 137.

mention. It was without the Pastorals, and the remaining Epistles were arranged in the following order, the most Pauline at the head: Galatians, First Corinthians, Second Corinthians, Romans, First and Second Thessalonians, Laodiceans (='Ephesians'), Colossians, Philippians, Philemon. The text was subjected to considerable mutilations, as we learn from critics of Marcion like Tertullian and Epiphanius. Whether the absence of the last two chapters of Romans in Marcion's edition is the result of excision or not seems doubtful: some scholars think Paul himself issued two editions of this Epistle—one for Rome, and another, lacking mention of Rome in chap. i. verses 7 and 15, and wanting the last two chapters, as a circular Epistle. The ἀποστολικόν of Marcion can be in great part reconstructed from the details provided by his critics, but as a separate work all of it has perished except the prologues to the Epistles and the chapter headings. These have survived in a Latin translation found in many MSS. of the Vulgate, etc.[1] It may be that Marcion himself is the originator of a number of petty variations which are characteristic of the Western text of the Epistles (preserved in D and other Greek MSS.). The Old-Syriac version of the Epistles seems to have been like his in text, just as the Gospel text of Tatian's Diatessaron finds its relations in West European texts.

JUSTIN MARTYR.—Justin, who lived and worked at Rome about 150, is a very loose quoter.[2] He appears to have made most use of the Matthaean Gospel, and in a text decidedly 'Western'; the company in which we find him is D, the

[1] The identification was made by Dom Donatien de Bruyne, O.S.B., of Maredsous, Belgium, in the *Revue Bénédictine*, xxiv. (1907), pp. 1-16, and (independently) by Dr. Peter Corssen, Berlin, in the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentl. Wissenschaft*, vol. x. (1909), pp. 1-45. Harnack, Harris, Burkitt and others have accepted the identification without question; see *e.g.* Burkitt's *The Gospel History and its Transmission* (ed. 3), (Edin. 1911). I have found the prologues and chapter headings in certain MSS. of the expansion of Pelagius's commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul, which passes under the name of Jerome: there they are obviously copied from a Vulgate MS.

[2] On the whole subject, see Sanday's chap. iv., especially pp. 113 ff., 133 ff., Bousset, *Die Evangelienzitate J.'s* (Gött. 1891), and H. von Soden, *op. cit.*, § 375.

Diatessaron, the Old-Latin, the Old-Syriac, the 'Clementine' Homilies. Interesting instances of readings in Justin are the Light at the Baptism (Matt. iii. 16), shared with the Diatessaron and the two Old-Latin MSS. *a* and *g*; 'Thou art' for 'This is' in Matt. iii. 17 (Luke iii. 22) with D, *a* of Old-Latin, Irenaeus, Hilary, and Augustine, etc.; ἐρῶ for ὁμολογήσω (or ὁμόσω) in Matt. vii. 23 with the oldest Old-Latin MSS., the Old-Syriac, the Diatessaron, Cyprian twice, and Augustine. But contrary to such authorities, or, rather, to some of them, he has Luke xxii. 19.

THE ACTS OF PAUL, composed by a presbyter of the province of Asia (possibly of Smyrna[1]), who was deposed from his office on confessing his guilt, dates from about 160. The work is based on the canonical Acts, and some points suggest that these were used in a Western text. For instance, in Acts xxi. 1, D has the insertion καὶ Μύρα: and this form appears to have been before the eyes of the presbyter.[2]

TATIAN.—All that we have found it necessary to say with regard to Tatian has already been said in the fourth chapter, in connexion with the Diatessaron. Reference must be made here, however, to the commentaries on the Gospels written by Isho'dad of Merv, Bishop of Hadatha about A.D. 850. This learned commentator compiled his work from earlier sources, the chief of which were Ephraim's commentary on the Diatessaron, and Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Gospels. The work has recently been published in Syriac and English by Mrs. M. D. Gibson, with an introduction by Dr. J. Rendel Harris.[3] Much of the Diatessaron is here preserved in a pure state, and Old-Syriac readings are to be found in considerable numbers.[4]

[1] An excellent suggestion of Carl Schmidt (*Acta Pauli, Übersetzung, Untersuchungen und koptischer Text, herausg. v.* C. S. 2te Ausg. [Leipzig, 1905], p. 205 n. 1) to account for the large number of proper names shared by Smyrnaean inscriptions with the *Acta Pauli*.

[2] Schmidt, p. 212. The writer has also used the Epistles, including the Pastorals.

[3] Cambridge University Press, 1911, vol. i. (English); vols. ii. and iii. (Syriac).

[4] See vol. i. pp. xxxvii f. for an enumeration.

It is now known that the Commentary of Dionysius Bar Salibi, written in the twelfth century, which used to be regarded as of high value for the sake of the authorities used, is hardly anything but a compilation from the Nestorian Isho'dad and the Monophysite Moses Bar Kepha.[1]

IRENAEUS.—Irenaeus, born about 140 in or near Smyrna, where he heard Bishop Polycarp, removed early in life to Rome, where he was a hearer of Justin Martyr, and apparently did not return to the East. As Bishop of Lyons he wrote his greatest work, probably about 185. The original Greek has perished, except for one fragment of papyrus MS., which has turned up in Egypt. We are dependent for the rest of what we have of the Greek on citations in later authors, who are under some suspicion of having altered the biblical quotations to a form more like that used by themselves. The greatest quoter is Epiphanius, of the second half of the fourth century, whose work is not yet satisfactorily edited.[2] Nevertheless, the tiny fragment from Oxyrhynchus strengthens emphatically the inference which we make from a study of the other materials at our disposal. It contains a quotation of Matt. iii. 16, 17, in which the following interesting readings occur: ὡς for ὡσεί with D and Eusebius, καί before ἐρχόμενον with D and the great mass of authorities, εἰς αὐτόν for ἐπ' αὐτόν with D and Eusebius, σὺ εἶ for οὗτός ἐστιν with D alone of Greek MSS. A remarkable likeness to *Codex Bezae* is thus evident. But there are differences. D has καταβαίνοντα (for καταβαῖνον), and adds ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. After λέγουσα, also, D has πρὸς αὐτόν. But, despite these differences, we shall not err greatly in concluding that Irenaeus's copy of the Gospel was practically equivalent to an early ancestor of the Greek side of *Codex Bezae*, excelling the latter by greater freedom from corruption. Dr. Conybeare tells me

[1] Harris in *op. cit.* pp. xxx f. Compare also his *Ephrem and the Gospel* (Cambridge, 1894).

[2] A scientific edition is to be expected from Dr. Karl Holl, who has already published *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Epiphanius* (*Ancoratus und Panarion*) (Leipzig, 1910).

that the recently edited Armenian translation of Books iv. and v. of Irenaeus's work increases the closeness to the Bezan text.[1] In Acts the case is the same exactly: *e.g.* Acts iv. 31, *παντὶ τῷ θέλοντι πιστεύειν*, shared by both, and so with the negative golden rule (xv. 20) and the *φερόμενοι ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι* of xv. 29 (cf. below).

Our knowledge of this work, however, is mainly derived from a complete and careful Latin translation which has survived. This translation was probably made in Africa in the second half of the fourth century.[2] It often follows the Greek exactly, but there is plenty of clear evidence in other cases that the translator was using a Latin Bible familiar to him.[3] When a long citation was made, it was convenient to look the passage out in the Latin Bible, and copy the translation thence. In general, where we cannot parallel the phraseology from the Latin Bible in any particular citation, we may conclude that at that point the translator is reproducing his Greek without referring to a Latin Bible. In the Gospels our translator had a text showing points of contact with *k*. The most glaring instance of this is a reference to Matt. v. 22, where the best MS. of Irenaeus lat. (Claromontanus of the ninth century, now at Berlin) shares with *k* the extraordinary corruption *pascitur* for *irascitur*: but there are a good many other cases of agreement. There are points of contact also with *d*. In Acts our translator shows agreements with *h*:

[1] *Irenaeus' gegen die Häretiker . . . in armen. Version entdeckt . . .* (Texte und Untersuchungen Band xxxv. (2), Leipzig, 1910). Dr. Conybeare's results are in print, and will be published in Sanday's *Novum Testamentum S. Irenaei*.

[2] My own conclusion (based on a minute lexicographical and stylistic argument, now in print), independently reached by Hort as to date (Westcott and Hort's introduction, § 220, a masterly summary of a lengthy argument which will be published complete in *Novum Testamentum S. Irenaei*, by Dr. Sanday and collaborators) and by Dr. H. Jordan as to date and locality (*Theologische Studien Theodor Zahn . . . zugebracht* [Leipzig, 1908], pp. 133-92, also separately). Nor ought Dodwell (*Dissertationes in Irenaeum*, Oxon., 1689) to be forgotten. See also O. Bardenhewer, *Patrologie*[3] (Freib., 1910), p. 97; Nestle, *Einführung*[3], p. 162.

[3] As the Latin translation shows undoubted traces of the Lucianic recension of the LXX in a long citation from Third Kingdoms (Rahlfs, *Septuaginta Studien*, iii. (Göttingen, 1911), pp. 116 ff., 138), it is clear that it cannot be earlier than the fourth century. Lucifer is the first Latin author of fixed date to show such traces (Rahlfs, pp. 143-54).

but the most striking agreement is that with *d*, namely in Acts iii. 14, where D *d* have *ἐβαρύνατε*, *grauastis*, and the Latin Irenaeus *adgrauastis*, while all other authorities have *ἠρνήσασθε* (denied). There are, in fact, a number of agreements with D in Acts (cf. xvii. 26), and it looks as if here also D were a fifth or a sixth century representative of the roll of Acts used by Irenaeus himself. In the Epistles of St. Paul and in the Apocalypse the type of text used by the translator is late—fourth century, in fact. In the former case he is in close relationship with the text used by Augustine; in the latter he is not far removed from the Vulgate itself. In his text of the Catholic Epistles there are two interesting points. In First Peter ii. 23 he has the clause *τυπτόμενος οὐκ ἀντέτυπτεν*, elsewhere found in Greek only in the Apostolic Canons: in First John iv. 3 he is the oldest authority for the reading *ὃ λύει*, shared with Clement, Origen, etc.[1]

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA became head of the Catechetical School in Alexandria shortly before 200. He is not a very careful quoter of Scripture, but, thanks to the researches of Mr. P. M. Barnard, it is now known that in the Gospels he used a text closely related to *Codex Bezae* (D).[2] Instances are: *ἔξωθεν* for *ἐκτός* in Matt. xxiii. 26, the omission of the second *ὑμᾶς* in Luke vi. 22, *διάγοντες* for *ὑπάρχοντες* in Luke vii. 25, the reversed order of clauses in Luke ix. 62, the shortest form of text in Luke x. 42, *προμεριμνᾶτε* in Luke xii. 11, *τὸ ἑπτάκις* in Luke xvii. 4, and so on. In Acts and the Epistles of Paul the relationship to the ℵ B type seems closer (cf. Acts xvii. 23, where *ἱστορῶν* in one of two citations is like D's *διιστορῶν*, but *ὅν* and *τοῦτον* in both citations follow the other family: also Rom. x. 9, 15, xiii. 13, 14; Gal. ii. 11, iii. 24). Many readings in the scanty manuscripts of Clement's works are doubtless due to scribal harmonisation with the late ecclesiastical text.

[1] In this investigation I have profited by the work of Dr. Sanday, Mr. Turner, and collaborators, as well as by the study necessary for my own lectures in the University of Oxford (1908-9).

[2] *The Biblical Text of Clement of Alexandria in the Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles* (Cambridge, 1899).

HIPPOLYTUS.—Of the voluminous works of this writer, who lived in or near Rome and in Sardinia († 236 or 237), but little survives in the original Greek. Yet enough remains to show that in the Gospels he used a good Western text. His citations of Matthew xiii. 43, xxiv. 48-49, and xxv. 41 suggest that he may also have used Tatian's Diatessaron on occasion. In the Epistles of Paul, also, he appears to have used a Western text: at least this is suggested by the text in which he quotes 1 Thess. iv. 13-17. In the Apocalypse his text is particularly important: there he is found to agree with the best authorities; for example, he reads *βασιλείαν* in chap. v. ver. 10, *θελήσωσιν* in xi. 6, *ἡρπάσθη* in xii. 5 (twice), *δῶσιν* in xiii. 16, *εἶδα* with A (only) in xvii. 3,[1] which certainly ought to be put in the text. The advent of the Jerusalem MS. (saec. x.) of the *De Antichristo* in G. N. Bonwetsch's edition (Leipzig, 1902) completely antiquates Tischendorf's reports of Hippolytus's readings, especially in chapters xvii. and xviii. of the Apocalypse.

ORIGEN.—Clement's successor Origen († 248), the greatest biblical scholar of the ancient world, had every then existing type of text at his disposal. It is therefore a matter of the greatest regret that, owing to dogmatic bias at the end of the fourth century and later, his works practically ceased to be copied; that in consequence we are confined to a few late (and bad) manuscripts of a few works or parts of works, and that those which were translated into Latin were rendered without due regard to the form of the biblical quotations.[2] Origen's practice was to dictate his works: sometimes he may have indicated the roll from which the amanuensis was to copy a passage of Scripture, sometimes he may have left it to the amanuensis himself. In him as in other ancient writers we occasionally find

[1] For another agreement of A and Hipp. see Apoc. xviii. 2. Read *ἔβαλον* with C Hipp. in xviii. 19.

[2] For instance, Bishop Westcott in his classical article 'Origen,' in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, long ago showed that Rufinus, in translating Origen on *Romans* into Latin, had substituted for Origen's biblical text a Latin text current at Aquileia in North Italy about 400—no doubt with the best motives!

that the comments presuppose a different text from that which precedes them. Dr. E. Hautsch has done good service in eliciting from comments of Origen's on the Gospels the text on which he must have been commenting.[1]

There is, in the first place, clear evidence that Origen was acquainted with a Gospel text of the D type. I borrow the following instances from Nestle: [2] Mark xiv. 36, the order δυνατὰ πάντα σοι (=D 565); Matthew x. 19, παραδώσουσιν (=D), instead of παραδῶσιν. But it is also true that in Origen's works we find the earliest clear traces of the opposite type of text, the Neutral or ℵ B type, though not nearly so often as the other. Instances will be found in my apparatus at the following places: Matt. xi. 9, xvii. 15, 22, xx. 17, xxi. 12; Mark i. 13, vii. 19; Luke xi. 2, xvi. 12, xxi. 19, xxiii. 45; John i. 15, xiii. 2, 26. Such readings may be in part due to the fact that Origen's writings were early circulated through an Alexandrian medium. Just as with Irenaeus and Clement, D most nearly represents his text, and perhaps the best way to describe the situation would be to say that Origen's favourite roll varied very seldom from the readings supported by B and D in common.

With regard to the Pauline Epistles, a fortunate discovery of Von der Goltz has put us in a much better position. In a MS. at the Laura monastery on Mount Athos [3] he found Origen's text of the Epistle to the Romans complete, which some biblical scholar in the tenth century had carefully copied out of a manuscript of Origen's commentary on that epistle in the original Greek, now lost. The MS. also contains considerable notes of what Origen read in particular places of other Epistles also, as well as the Catholic Epistles and Acts. With G and 1908^{mg} [4] Origen left out ἐν Ῥώμῃ in Rom. i. 7, but on the

[1] *Die Evangelienzitate des Origenes* (Leipzig, 1909).

[2] *Einführung* (ed. 3), p. 162.

[3] 1739^{ap} in Gregory's list (B 64 is the shelfmark in the Laura). Von der Goltz, *Eine textkritische Arbeit des* 10 *bezw.* 6 *Jhdts.* (Leipzig, 1899).

[4] 1908 is an eleventh-century MS. at Oxford, which has some considerable connexion with Origen (and with MS. 1739). The corrector of the eleventh-century Vienna MS. (known as 424**) is also related (cf. Gal. iii. 8).

whole it is the Neutral text to which he witnesses in this Epistle (cf. ii. 16 with ℵ B, Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, etc.). In the Epistle to the Hebrews Origen's text is most nearly represented by M (or 0121), ninth-century fragments at London and Hamburg.

PAMPHILUS and EUSEBIUS.—The martyr Pamphilus († 309), already referred to, had been educated at Alexandria, and the main part of the theological library which he founded at Caesarea in Palestine consisted of the voluminous works of Origen on rolls. His pupil and protégé, Eusebius († 339-40), afterwards Bishop of Caesarea, had full use of this collection. We are not surprised, therefore, to find Eusebius ranged on the side of D and Origen in the Gospels. He is, however, a most unsatisfactory quoter from our point of view, as he rarely indulges in a long citation.

ATHANASIUS († 373) and CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA († 444) both, according to Hermann von Soden, used for the most part what he calls the *H* text.[1] This text is practically identical with Westcott and Hort's Neutral. The study of Cyril's Gospel text has been seriously hindered by the method which the Oxford editor employed in publishing his Commentaries on St. John.[2] The discovery of further leaves of a papyrus of a work of Cyril confirms Von Soden's conclusion as to the sort of text employed by him in the Gospels.[3]

BASIL OF CAESAREA († 379), GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS († 389 or 390), and GREGORY OF NYSSA († 395?).—The three Cappadocian Fathers, as they are commonly called, all used, according to Von Soden, the same type of text, that found in the purple MSS. of the Gospels, already described.[4] This text has ancient elements still present in it, but is in the main the same as the official ecclesiastical text associated with Constantinople and the regions under her influence.

[1] *Die Schriften*, u.s.w., §§ 336 (correct his index, Bd. i. p. 2178), 397, 457, 492.

[2] Cf. Nestle's *Einführung*[3], p. 159.

[3] See p. 21 above.

[4] See pp. 9, 30 f. above. Von Soden, *Die Schriften*, u.s.w., pp. 1466 ff.

CHRYSOSTOM († 407) was the first great writer to use the fully developed ecclesiastical text, and his influence as Metropolitan of Constantinople and a distinguished preacher and commentator no doubt greatly extended its use. In fact, Von Soden makes him the first reviser of his *K* (or Κοινή) type of text, which is roughly that of the great bulk of our manuscripts.[1] There are in him no traces of the Neutral text, but plenty of evidence that he was acquainted with 'Western' texts[2]: for example, he knew the reading ἐπιψαύσεις τοῦ χριστοῦ in Eph. v. 14. These readings Von Soden thinks he got from Origen. Chrysostom never quoted the lesser Catholic Epistles or the Apocalypse.

Later Greek Fathers, like Theodoret of Cyrus († *ca.* 458) and John of Damascus († *ca.* 750), used substantially the same text as Chrysostom.

COSMAS INDICOPLEUSTES, merchant of Alexandria († *ca.* 550 ?), used in the Gospels a late Alexandrian type of text, like L, but in Acts employed a text almost identical with B.[3]

§ 2. LATIN WRITERS

For the most part the evidence for the text of the Latin Fathers (including the biblical quotations cited by them) is much more abundant and in a much purer state than the Greek and Syriac evidence. Many of the Latin Fathers' works exist in copies almost coeval with the authors themselves. There is extant quite a respectable number of sixth-century MSS. preserving works written by fourth- or fifth-century authors, and quite a cluster of MSS. of the works of Gregory the Great († 604) and the Venerable Bede († 735), practically contemporary with the authors themselves. For the most part these precious MSS. lie unopened in the libraries of Europe, or are looked into only by the palæographer and the cataloguer. The printed

[1] *Die Schriften*, u.s.w., § 332.

[2] Dean Robinson's *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians* (London, 1903, and later), p. 300.

[3] This fact becomes for the first time clear in E. O. Winstedt's edition of *Cosmas* (Cambridge, 1909).

editions of the Latin Fathers, with the exception of those in the Vienna *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* and a few others, are unreliable in questions of New Testament textual criticism. The early editions were mostly printed from one MS. which happened to be accessible to the printer. If it were a fifteenth-century MS., so much the easier would the printer's task be, as he could not but be familiar with a script practically contemporary with himself. Succeeding editors were often content to reprint without alteration, with slight improvement, or with alteration for the worse. But there is no longer any excuse for this, with the improved conditions of travel and the increased accessibility of MSS., and after the work of a century or so it will be possible to write a splendid account of the history of the Latin Bible, both Old-Latin and Vulgate. Meantime, only certain writers, whose texts are published (or accessible to the present writer) in primitive purity, can be alluded to here.

TERTULLIAN of Carthage († 222) wrote particularly in Latin, but also in Greek. He also sometimes used a Latin Bible, sometimes a Greek, probably oftener the former than the latter. It is improbable that his Greek Bible was very different in text from the Greek text underlying his Latin Bible. A curious defect in one or other of these occurred in Hebrews vi. 5, where in the archetype of one of these rolls the text read :

ΝΟΥΣΘ͞ΥΡΗΜΑΔΥΝ
ΑΜΕΙΣΤΕΜΕΛΛ
ΟΝΤΟΣΑΙΩΝΟΣΚΑΙ

The copyist, however, who wrote Tertullian's copy, omitted the second line, and thus he reads δύνοντος. The character of his text in general is, of course, 'Western.' Dr. Sanday long ago put the textual position in the Gospels thus : 'The hypothesis that Tertullian used a manuscript in the main resembling *b* of the Old-Latin satisfies most elements of the problem.' [1] I am informed that the Vienna edition,

[1] The best summary known to me of the Tertullianean evidence is in his *Gospels in the Second Century* (London, 1876), pp. 333-43. The quotation above made is from page 342.

so far as it has appeared, does not exhibit the biblical quotations in an appreciably different form from that which they have in the good edition of Oehler. The Greek MS. with which Tertullian is in most frequent agreement is D; among Greek Fathers he finds his chief allies in Clement and Origen. He is farthest removed from B among the Greek MSS.[1]

CYPRIAN.—In the Gospels, Cyprian of Carthage († 258), a most accurate quoter, is practically identical with *k* in text. Sometimes one appears to be more primitive than the other, and the text has certainly some history behind it. In Acts and the Apocalypse Cyprian goes consistently with the fragmentary palimpsest known as *h*. I have suggested that his text of the Pauline Epistles is the earliest for that part of the New Testament,[2] but this suggestion perhaps ought to be retracted, as 2 Tim. iv. 3 bears secondary traces (a double rendering of *κνηθόμενοι τὴν ἀκοήν*).[3]

NEMESIANUS OF TUBUNAS in Numidia, a contemporary of Cyprian, and, like him, present at the Rebaptism Synod of Carthage in 256, read the Epistles of Paul from a different translation.[4] In some ways his form is nearer to Tertullian's, and it is more probable that the rustic would use an earlier form than the citizen of the great capital.

NOVATIAN (or Novatus) of Rome († 257 ?) used a text like *a* in St. John, and in the Epistles of Paul one related to *d* (see also Lucifer).

HILARY OF POITIERS († 366) used in the Gospels a text having points of contact with *r* (the Irish-Latin *Codex Usserianus* of the sixth century). No doubt Great Britain and Ireland first got the Gospel from Gaul.

[1] It must, however, be noted that in Matt. i. 16 he agrees with ℵ B and the bulk of MSS., just as he does in Luke i. 46, where he deserts his ally *b*.

[2] *Study of Ambrosiaster* (Cambridge, 1905), pp. 213 f.

[3] Lactantius in Africa (saec. iv. early), Firmicus Maternus in Sicily († saec. iv. med.), Zeno of Verona († 373?), Commodian (saec. v.) in Gaul, found it convenient to use Cyprian's excerpts from Scripture in preference to Scripture itself.

[4] See C. H. Turner in *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. ii. (1900-1), pp. 602 ff.

This sort of text, therefore, is what we should expect to find.[1]

LUCIFER OF CAGLIARI in Sardinia († 370 or 371). In the Gospel of John his text is the same as that of *a*, in Acts practically the same as *gigas*, and in the Epistles of Paul the same as that of *d* (except in the longer Epistles where *d* has been harmonised with the Vulgate).

'AMBROSIASTER.'—This writer (*flor.* 375-85 at Rome and in Spain), whose works were issued anonymously, but are attributed in manuscripts to Hilary, Ambrose, and Augustine, is generally agreed now to have been Isaac, a converted Jew, the enemy of Pope Damasus. His importance for the textual critic lies in the fact that one of his works is a commentary on the Pauline Epistles (excluding Hebrews), at the basis of one of the editions of which lies a complete Old-Latin text of the Epistles of Paul. The text, which is related to *d* and *g* (the Latin side of *Codex Boernerianus*, saec. ix.), is like that used by Ambrose, and may have been the very text which Jerome took as the basis of the Vulgate. The writer used a Gospel text like *b*, but not exclusively. In Acts his text was identical with *gigas*. In the Apocalypse there are points of contact with the Old-African text preserved by Primasius (for which see below), and also with *gigas*.

PRISCILLIAN of Spain († 385) used a text identical with *m* (the Speculum) in the Catholic Epistles, and in the Apocalypse a text which has points of contact with *gigas*. The prologues found in many Vulgate MSS. of the Gospels are probably his.[2] No one seems as yet to have studied the relationship between the text used by this writer and his contemporary and compatriot, Gregory of Elvira († *ca.* 400 ?).

AMBROSE of Milan († 397) based his works largely on Greek sources, and perhaps partly on this account is a very unsatisfactory quoter of the Latin Bible. In the

[1] Bonnassieux, *Les Evangiles Synoptiques de S. Hilaire de P.* (Lyon, 1906).
[2] See Dom Chapman in *Revue Bénédictine*, xxiii. (1906), pp. 335-49, or *Notes on the Early History of the Vulgate Gospels* (Oxford, 1908), chap. xiii.

Gospels he appears to have employed a text like *ff*[2] (cf. Luke xxiv. 13), and in the Epistles of Paul perhaps the same text as the 'Ambrosiaster.'

JEROME (Eusebius Sofronius Hieronymus, † 420) was like Origen in his extensive knowledge of various types of text. In Luke he certainly used the *a* type. In Acts there are signs that he used a type related to *gig* and *p* (cf. ii. 14-18 cited in *Epist.* xli. 1, § 2 (p. 312, Hilberg)), but this was not the type he used as the basis of the Vulgate. In the Epistles of Paul we find him showing points of contact with *d*, *m*, Lucifer and Ambrosiaster, but perhaps he is a little nearer to his own Vulgate there than any of these other texts is.

AUGUSTINE of Hippo Regius, in North Africa († 430), used for the Gospels until about 400 a text like that of *e*, but after that date he used the Vulgate for long citations, while he still cited from memory in short passages the type with which he had been acquainted in his earlier days. In Acts, Apocalypse, and Catholic Epistles he used such a text as *h*. In the case of the Epistles of Paul he employed a text like *r*, but it is to be remembered that this *r* is not unrelated to *d*.[1]

PELAGIUS (the oldest British writer of whom any work has survived) issued about 409 a commentary on the Pauline Epistles (excluding Hebrews) at Rome. The text used appears to be Vulgate, as it agrees constantly with either Fuldensis or Amiatinus, and has *porro* at 1 Cor. vii. 35.[2] But it has some readings which are not generally considered to be Vulgate; for instance, it gives the positive form in Gal. ii. 5. If the text used by Pelagius be really pure Vulgate throughout, it is the earliest of all extant authorities for the Vulgate of the Pauline Epistles, and the divergences of leading Vulgate MSS. from the text used by him will have to be explained. Meantime, the text is not published, and it would be premature to decide finally

[1] Burkitt's *Old Latin and the Itala* (Cambridge, 1896), p. 78; *Journal of Theological Studies*, xi. (1909-10), p. 464.

[2] See above, p. 50.

on the point.[1] In Acts he used an Old-Latin text; for instance, he has the interpolation in chap. iv. 31. In the Catholic Epistles he shows points of contact with *Codex Fuldensis*. I hope to give further particulars in my edition.

PATRICK, the Apostle of the Irish († 461), used in the Gospels a text with very ancient traits; for example, in John viii. 34 he omits τῆς ἁμαρτίας.

FULGENTIUS OF RUSPE in Africa († 533) used in the Catholic Epistles a text the same as that now called *q*, sixth-century fragments now at Munich, but written in Spain, and probably for long preserved at Bobbio in North Italy.[2]

PRIMASIUS, BISHOP OF HADRUMETUM (Africa) († before 567), compiled a commentary on the Apocalypse from earlier sources, like Victorinus of Poetouio (Pettau) († 303), and Tichonius the Donatist († before 400), which is interesting enough in itself. The value of the work to the New Testament textual critic is due to the fact that he used as the basis of the compilation a text of the Apocalypse over three hundred years older than his own time, namely, that of *h* Cyprian and Augustine.[3] A commentary on the Epistles of Paul attributed to him accidentally by its first modern editor, Jean Gagney (Lyons, 1537), and since reprinted under his name, was recently proved to be the work of Cassiodorus and his pupils.[4]

CASSIODORUS († *ca.* 570), prime minister of Theodoric, retired about 540 to his ancestral estate of Vivarium, near

[1] The commentary was discovered by the present writer in its original form in July 1906 at Karlsruhe: readings are given according to the sole MS. in my apparatus to the Greek Testament. See *The Commentary of Pelagius on the Epistles of Paul: the Problem of its Restoration* (*Proceedings of the British Academy*, vol. ii.), (London, 1907); *Journal of Theological Studies*, viii. (1906-7), pp. 526-36. It will be published in the Cambridge *Texts and Studies*.

[2] See Traube, *Nomina Sacra* (München, 1907), pp. 190 f.

[3] See Haussleiter in Zahn's *Forschungen*, iv. (1890). Hans von Soden, *Das lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur Zeit Cyprians* (Leipzig, 1909).

[4] This view, suggested first by C. H. Turner, *Journal of Theological Studies*, iv. (1902-3), pp. 140 f., was conclusively proved right by the present writer: *The Commentary of Pelagius on the Epistles of Paul: the Problem of its Restoration* (London, 1907), p. 20.

Squillace, in the very south of Italy. There he founded a seminary for the training of clergy, and for their use equipped an admirable theological library, a full description of which is provided in his *Institutiones Diuinarum et Saecularium Lectionum*. The most interesting part of this work is the place where he speaks about the Bibles in this library. Both the Old-Latin and the Vulgate were represented. It has been proved beyond all doubt that our *Codex Amiatinus* in the Gospels is descended from the New Testament part of his copy of the Vulgate. In his time Pelagius on the Epistles was in wide use as an anonymous work, the real authorship of which seems to have been unsuspected. Cassiodorus, however, scented Pelagianism in it, and rewrote the Commentary on Romans, leaving the Commentaries on the other Epistles to be treated by his pupils in the same way. This anti-pelagianised Pelagius survives in print under the name Primasius: the only surviving MS. of the work, however, is anonymous, like the work of which it is a revision. Now that both Pelagius and Cassiodorus and Co. have been identified, it is possible to study the treatment applied by Cassiodorus and his pupils. We are here concerned only with the biblical text. Pelagius's text, as we have seen, is Vulgate. This text Cassiodorus in Romans revises to a form almost verbally identical throughout with *Codex Amiatinus*. His pupils, however, in the other Epistles, wherever they have altered Pelagius's text, have altered it to agree with a form of the Old-Latin not unlike *d*. As a matter of fact, Cassiodorus himself, in his *Complexiones in Epistulas, Acta Apostolorum, et Apocalypsin*, has used a text of exactly the same kind, and not the Vulgate. He, like Gregory the Great, his later contemporary, used now one, now the other.[1]

The VENERABLE BEDE († 735) links up with Cassiodorus, as he used in Northumbria Cassiodorian Bibles, or parts of Bibles, brought from Italy by Benedict Biscop and

[1] I am much indebted to Dom Chapman for lending me an investigation he had himself made into the text of Pseudo-Primasius; cf. his article in the *Revue Bénédictine*, XXVIII. (1911), pp. 283-95.

Ceolfrid. His biblical text is greatly disguised in the bad edition of Dr. Giles. For example, in his Commentary on the Epistle of James, Bede used a text nearly identical with *Codex Amiatinus*, as a collation of the Bodleian MS. dated 818 has shown me; but no one would suspect this from the late doctored form of the text which Dr. Giles prints. Bede is fond of comparing the Old-Latin and the Vulgate, as Dr. Plummer has pointed out in his admirable edition of the historical works.[1] Bede on Acts, as we have already seen, used E (*Codex Laudianus*).[2] A scientific edition of the complete works of Bede is one of the prime necessities of patristic scholarship, and it ought to be a point of honour with this country to supply it.

Farther down we need not go, though the subject is far from being exhausted. All the mediæval Latin commentaries also must be critically edited before they can yield up their evidence for the history of the New Testament. Some have never even been printed.[3]

§ 3. Syriac Writers

For a full account of these, as affecting the text of the Gospels, the reader is referred to Burkitt's *Evangelion da-Mepharreshê*, vol. ii. pp. 110-212.

Acts of Judas Thomas.—This work, written originally in Syriac, exhibits quotations from the Gospels neither according to the Diatessaron, nor according to the Peshitta, but according to the Old-Syriac.[4] In no other work are the traces of the Old-Syriac so clear.

Aphraates, whose *Homilies* were composed in 337, 344, and 345, uses the Diatessaron habitually, but has coincidences in language with the Old-Syriac. He has practically no points of contact with the Peshitta exclusively.[5]

[1] Tom i. (Oxford, 1896), pp. liv f.
[2] P. 29.
[3] For instance, some of Claudius of Turin's (saec. ix. in.) commentaries on the Pauline Epistles, preserved in MSS. almost coeval with the author.
[4] Burkitt, ii. pp. 101 ff.
[5] *Op. cit.*, pp. 109 ff.

It is not possible to say much of Aphraates's quotations from the Epistles of Paul.

St. Ephraem Syrus's works († 373) have been badly edited. An examination of the MSS. of his works has shown Burkitt that Ephraim had no knowledge of the Peshitta, as used to be thought, but used the Diatessaron only, in citing the Gospels.[1] This discovery cleared the way for the correct dating of the Peshitta.

Isho'dad of Merv.—See above, pages 78 f.

[1] *S. Ephraem's Quotations from the Gospel* (Cambridge, 1901); *Evang. da-Mepharreshê*, ii. pp. 112 ff.

CHAPTER VIII

PRINTED EDITIONS OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT AND VERSIONS

§ 1. GREEK

First Period

THE honour of printing the earliest edition of the Greek New Testament belongs to the distinguished Spanish Cardinal Ximenes (Francisco Jimenez de Cisneros), who planned a great Bible, known now as the COMPLUTENSIAN POLYGLOT, because it was published at the (then [1]) university town of Alcalá de Henares (*Lat.* Complutum), twenty-two miles east of Madrid, and birthplace of Cervantes. Ximenes employed for this work especially a fellow-countryman, Iago Lopez de Stunica. The printing of the New Testament was ended on 10th January 1514. The publication of the entire work, of which the printing came to an end on 10th July 1517, was delayed, because the Pope, Leo X., deferred his permission till 22nd March 1520, owing to the fact that two Vatican MSS., which had been lent for the purpose of the edition, had not been returned. Six hundred copies only were printed, and few survive. The New Testament is in two columns—the Greek text on the left, and a Latin translation on the right. Knowledge of Greek was exceedingly rare outside Italy at this time, and the learner was aided by this word-for-word translation, equipped with symbols giving a key to each word in the Greek. The accented syllable in each Greek word was provided with an acute accent. With regard

[1] The university was transferred to Madrid early last century.

to the manuscripts employed for the text of the New Testament nothing can be said except that they must have been late. Probably one MS. of each group of books was used as 'copy' for the printer, being modified where the editor or editors considered it was wrong. The printing of the work is carefully done.

The delay in the receipt of the papal permission enabled another edition, though printed later, to be published earlier than the Complutensian. This was the work of the brilliant humanist, Desiderius ERASMUS (Geert Geerts), of Rotterdam, and appeared at Basle in Switzerland in 1516. The enterprising and scholarly publisher of that city, John Froben, wrote on 15th March 1515 to Erasmus, who was then in England, and summoned him to Basle to undertake the edition. This the versatile scholar agreed to do, and the pair worked with such incredible speed that the volume issued from the press on 1st March 1516. The task took only ten months, and probably not more than about seven MSS. were employed, most of which are still at Basle.[1] The MSS., with one exception (now numbered 1), were neither ancient nor valuable. The last six verses of the Apocalypse were wanting in the only MS. of that book he had, and he retranslated them (except verse 20, where he had Laurentius Valla's translation) from the Vulgate Latin, owning to what he had done.[2] The book is full of printers' errors, and in the Apocalypse the Complutensian gives a better text. Erasmus added a Latin translation of his own, and explanatory notes. Further issues of Erasmus's edition appeared in 1519 (for which an extra MS. was used), 1522 (where 1 John v. 7 was introduced from a forged entry in a sixteenth-century MS., now at Dublin), 1527 (for which the Complutensian was used, and the Vulgate added), and 1535.

Here and elsewhere considerations of space compel the omission of various editions.

[1] The MS. he used for the Apocalypse is at Maihingen (Germany).

[2] Elsewhere also in the Apocalypse (*e.g.* vi. 1, etc.) we find traces of his hand.

Robert Estienne (Latinised Robertus STEPHANUS), royal printer at Paris, published there in 1546, with the help of his son Henri (HENRICUS), a Greek New Testament in two little volumes. This edition was based on preceding editions, especially the last Erasmian. A second edition appeared in 1549. To 1550 belongs the third edition, in folio, called 'regia,' a sumptuous volume, which was destined to play a great part in the history of the printed Greek New Testament. This is the earliest edition of all to contain a critical apparatus, that is, a record of variations in reading exhibited by the authorities. For it fifteen manuscripts were employed, but their use hardly affects the text. Already there seems to have arisen a fictitious worship for the letter of Erasmus's last edition, and often what is now regarded as unquestionably the right reading is to be found on Stephanus's inner margin, not in his text. Nearly all Stephanus's MSS. can still be identified. A later issue is that of 1551 (published at Geneva, where the editor retired on proclaiming his Protestantism), which is the first edition of the New Testament to contain our modern verses, the work of Stephanus himself.

The next editions of note are those of Théodore de Bèze (Theodorus BEZA), of which the most interesting is that published at Geneva in 1582. For this D and D^{paul} as well as other fresh authorities were used.[1]

Printers' enterprise continued to play a great part in the dissemination of the Greek New Testament. Of this there is no more conspicuous example than that of the Elzevir editions, published at Leiden, seven in number, from 1624 to 1678. In the preface to the second edition (1633) occur the innocent words, to which a meaning never intended was afterwards for long attached: 'TEXTUM ergo habes, nunc ab omnibus RECEPTUM, in quo nihil immutatum aut corruptum damus.' The first was simply a reprint of Beza's 1565 edition, and the others varied but little from it. The text, which was to enslave the Greek Testament student for two hundred years and more, was based really

[1] There are traces of these in Stephanus's 1550 edition already, however.

on Erasmus's last edition, the Complutensian Polyglot, and a handful of manuscripts—in fact, on something like a hundredth part of the Greek evidence now at our disposal, not to speak of versions and citations. Estienne's 1550 text ruled in England, and the Elzevir on the Continent, the two being practically identical. Till 1904 the British and Foreign Bible Society continued to circulate this Elzevir text.

The LONDON POLYGLOT next deserves mention, as a monumental work not even yet entirely superseded. It appeared in 1657, edited by Brian Walton (afterwards Bishop of Chester), aided by other great British scholars. A very large body of various readings is presented in this work, but the text remains practically that of Stephanus's 1550. The anonymous edition of John Fell, afterwards Bishop of Oxford, was published at Oxford in 1675, a little volume somewhat dumpy, yet not without charm. Various readings are under the text, which is Elzevir's 1633 slightly altered. Collations of previously unused MSS., preserved at Oxford, Paris, and Dublin, were employed, and some of the ancient versions were studied with care.

The closing edition of the first period must not be mentioned without a reference to two great critics who belong to this period, and whose work has very great significance for the study of the Greek New Testament, though neither published an edition. LUCAS of Bruges (BRUGENSIS) in his brief *Notae ad Varias Lectiones Editionis Graecae Evangeliorum*, published in 1606, was probably the earliest scholar to make use of all three sources for the New Testament text.[1] RICHARD SIMON, a French Oratorian, published three great works at Rotterdam in 1689, 1690, and 1693 respectively: *Histoire critique du texte du Nouveau Testament* (English translation, London, 1689), *Histoire critique des versions du Nouveau Testament* (English translation, London, 1692), and *Histoire critique des principaux commentateurs du Nouveau Testament* (hardly obtainable

[1] C. H. Turner in Murray's *Illustrated Dictionary of the Bible* (art. 'New Testament, Text of'), p. 585 A

in the original, and never translated into English; even yet by far the most valuable authority on its subject).[1] It would be impossible to exaggerate the value and suggestiveness of Simon's works.

This first period is the period of a stereotyped text, taken from late manuscripts, but men began in it to write about New Testament criticism.

Second Period

John MILL, who began to prepare an edition of the Greek Testament in 1677, continued his work for thirty years: for it was not till 1707 that his great work saw the light. Mill presents Estienne's text of 1550 but for a handful of passages. The real value of his edition consists in the abundance of textual material collected and in the masterly introduction not yet entirely superseded. He made or procured collations of a number of previously unused Greek MSS., and spent much labour on the ancient versions, especially the Old-Latin and the Vulgate. He was the first editor to give due weight to the patristic citations of the New Testament, especially Greek and Latin.

Richard BENTLEY (1662-1742), Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, one of the greatest classical scholars of this or any country, was the first great textual critic to plan an edition. His knowledge of both Greek and Latin was colossal, his familiarity with manuscripts and the ways of scribes was no less wonderful, and he had a vision of a Greek and a Latin text restored to the state in which they were in the fourth century. He believed that, given MSS. of pure text, we should see no difference between the Greek and the Latin but difference of language at that period. At an early age he began to correspond with various *savants* on the subject, and in 1720 he published the proposals for his edition. His chief collaborator was John

[1] Add also *Nouvelles Observations sur le texte et les versions du Nouveau Testament* (Paris, 1695). Simon's works gave rise to a small library of controversial literature, most of which is now forgotten.

Walker, Fellow of Trinity, whose collections have survived. All this great preparation produced no edition, however. It was not the opposition which the obscurantist Conyers Middleton, author of a respectable *Life of Cicero*, sought to arouse against him, but rather the feeling that he had been too optimistic about the settled state of the text in the fourth century, and about the possibility of arriving at it in his own time, that prevented the publication of the edition. Bentley's work must not be overlooked. The impulse he gave to these studies was such, that but for him there would have been no Lachmann and no Hort.

Mace (1720), Bowyer (1772), and Harwood (1776), the first and the last being Nonconformists, did pioneer work, which availed little in their own generation but to arouse mulish obstinacy against their efforts.

John Albert BENGEL, author of the 'Gnomon,' a commentary no less distinguished for its spiritual than for its philological insight, published a Greek New Testament at Tübingen in 1734. He was the first editor to introduce the principle, now almost universally recognised, that authorities must be classified and weighed, not counted.

J. J. WETTSTEIN edited the Greek Testament in two folio volumes (Amsterdam, 1751-2), with a learned commentary. So valuable is the amount of illustrative material, particularly from classical and Jewish literature, that those who know the commentary best would not hesitate to place it first among all that ever one man has produced. It is no less valuable to-day than it was before, though succeeding commentators have plundered it.[1] He prints the Elzevir text, but below it he gives the readings which are in his opinion genuine. He was the first to employ the modern method of indicating manuscripts by letters and numbers—a method which has stood the test of a century and a half, and has doubtless still a long life before

[1] May I join my plea to that of Professor Adolf Deissmann of Berlin that a new edition of this work should be undertaken? No one could render a greater service to New Testament study than by devoting a lifetime to the satisfactory performance of this task.

it, especially as the defects of the system have been removed by Professor Gregory.[1]

J. J. GRIESBACH published the Greek New Testament at Halle, the first edition in 1774-7, the second in 1796-1806.[2] The apparatus he compiled is rich in all the three classes of evidence, in the study of which he had thoroughly trained himself. Succeeding editors have learnt a deal from him. He first distinguished a Western, an Alexandrian, and a Byzantine recension, much as Von Soden now does.

C. F. MATTHAEI'S editions appeared in 1782-8 and 1803-7. He was a most industrious and accurate collator of manuscripts, both of the New Testament and of the commentaries of St. Chrysostom. These manuscripts, preserved at Moscow, had come from Athos, and were of considerable importance.

A. Birch collected *variae lectiones* from the manuscripts of Denmark (1798, 1800, 1801), and F. C. Alter performed a similar service for those at Vienna (1787, 1786).

Strong interest in the Greek New Testament has not been characteristic of the Church of Rome, but J. M. A. SCHOLZ published in 1830 and 1836 a handsome quarto edition. The text printed is practically Griesbach's. Scholz's principal service is his description of a large number of MSS. previously unexamined, but he was not very accurate.

He closes the second period, a period of strife between those who followed the so-called *textus receptus* blindly, and those who were determined to secure the most ancient witnesses they could and to trust them. The inferior character of the bulk of the later testimony was now evident to the trained critics as a whole. It was reserved for the third period to shake itself entirely free of the shackles of the *textus receptus*, and to make glorious attempts to restore the words of the original autographs as nearly as possible, by concentrating attention on the oldest and purest evidence attainable.

[1] *Die griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (Leipzig, 1908).
[2] The smaller editions of 1805 and 1803-7 must also be mentioned.

Third Period

If Bentley is the great hero of the second period, his understudy, Carl LACHMANN, is the protagonist of the third. Like Bentley, he had breathed the bracing air of classical philology. With a 'desperate hook' like that of his master he slashed off the great mass of the later evidence, and succeeded in achieving very much what the English philologist desired to do. Of several editions which he brought out the most significant is that of 1842-50, in which both the Greek and the Vulgate Latin are presented in the greatest purity that Lachmann and his colleague P. Buttmann could attain. The introduction is comparable to Mill's and Hort's in importance. His aim was to secure the text in widest use in Jerome's time, leaving it to emendation and conjecture to get behind that. As his foundation he took A B C, H (some portions), a few other uncials, and Origen. These witnesses, of course, do not provide a complete New Testament, and Origen is not fourth century; sometimes he was reduced to A only, sometimes to B only, and the latter and C were imperfectly known. When the Eastern authorities did not agree, he turned to D^2 G^2 *a b c d* d^2 *ff g*, Irenaeus, Cyprian, Hilary, Lucifer, and, for the Apocalypse, Primasius. The third line consisted of 'mixed' witnesses, D E *e* and the Vulgate. Even these, of course, are not adequate to represent the West clearly. When all these authorities fail to produce any evidence, or what he believes to be the right reading, he turns to the late ordinary MSS. This of course is a makeshift, but even the late MSS. must have really ancient elements in them. The defects of material and the lesser defects in method, which in a weak man would have wrought destruction, were often surmounted by the critical acumen of Lachmann, whose thews were being all the while tightened by his grapples with the hard textual problem of Lucretius. Lachmann would certainly have done at least what Westcott and Hort did, if he had had the materials they had at his disposal.

G. F. C. TISCHENDORF (1815-74) edited more New Testament documents and more editions of the New Testament than any other scholar who ever lived. His greatest services are his discovery of *Codex Sinaiticus* and his eighth edition of the Greek Testament (completed 1872), the largest repertory of authorities and the fullest critical apparatus which exists. The great aim of his life of unceasing industry seems to have been to edit carefully as many of the very oldest Greek and Latin New Testament documents as he could discover. He thus edited ℵ, B, CE, etc., among Greek uncials, and *Codex Amiatinus* of the Latin Vulgate. In his eighth edition it is generally held that he gave too much weight to the readings of ℵ.

S. P. TREGELLES (1813-75), his English contemporary, worked very much on parallel lines, doing much collation of early documents. His edition, which comprises not only the Greek text in large clear type, but also a large and well-arranged apparatus, as well as the text of the Vulgate from *Codex Amiatinus*, appeared from 1857 to 1872 (prolegomena, 1879). Among Greek writers he does not cite any later than Eusebius, and among Latin none later than Lucifer, except Primasius. His text is close to Lachmann's, and would have been nearer Tischendorf's than it is, if it had not been for the greater amount of material at Tischendorf's disposal. Tregelles's great service was to draw English-speaking scholars away from the *textus receptus*.

J. W. Burgon and F. H. Scrivener did not publish recensions, but both did useful work in collating minuscule MSS., and Burgon also made a wonderful collection of references to New Testament quotations in the Fathers, now preserved in the British Museum.[1] They were both, on the whole, defenders of the *textus receptus*, and Burgon's views found a vigorous exponent in E. Miller.[2] These writers appear to have left few, if any, successors.

[1] Paul de Lagarde (formerly Bötticher) indexed the quotations of Augustine. His index is in the library of Göttingen University.

[2] *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels* . . . (London, 1896); *The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels* (London, 1896);

The greatest edition ever published is that by Brooke Foss WESTCOTT († Bishop of Durham, 1901) and Fenton John Anthony HORT († Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, Cambridge, 1892). It was published in 1881 almost coincidently with the Revised Version of the English New Testament, on which it had exercised much influence, as it had been in the hands of revisers for several years in proof. Westcott and Hort spent twenty-eight years over this work, exchanging with one another a voluminous correspondence on the subject, the publication of which is expected at no distant date. The spade-work, the originating work, seems to have been for the most part done by Hort, but his views were always subjected to the closest attention by his colleague, and the work is therefore to be regarded as a joint work, for which both were equally responsible. Their aim was not so much to collect fresh materials—though the discerning will discover traces enough of these—but to value all the mass of evidence already gathered together by their predecessors down to Tischendorf and Tregelles. Their introduction, in which textual principles are enunciated with convincing power, and a brilliant classification and characterisation of authorities are given, is an achievement never surpassed in the scholarship of any country. The notes on select readings are only less valuable. The uninitiated reader ought probably to be informed that behind such a brief and succinct statement as that on the New Testament text of St. Irenaeus (Introduction, § 220) there lies an exhaustive investigation of the problem by Hort himself, which the present writer has been privileged to read. Their work is held in the highest esteem in all civilised countries,[1] and on the foundation they have laid the future will do well

A Textual Commentary upon the Holy Gospels (Matt. i.-xiv.) (London, 1899). Much of the evidence in these works is in an impure state, through the use of faulty editions.

[1] No better proof is needed than the fact that Bernhard Weiss's text [i. 1894 (2nd ed. 1902), ii. 1896 (2nd ed. 1902), iii. 1900 (2nd ed. 1905)] differs little from Westcott and Hort's. His readings can be most readily obtained in E. Nestle's handy and accurate edition of the New Testament (Stuttgart Bible Society), 1st ed. 1898, 7th ed. 1908.

to build. The following chapters will outline their principles.

Their edition is the first to place readings in the margin that in their opinion are equally well attested with those put by them in the text. They also put some Western readings in the margin, with a special symbol, on the ground that they are interesting, and have very ancient attestation. A further specialty of the edition is the use of the obelus (dagger †) where they regard the text as corrupt and in need of emendation.

Of minor works, which are not fresh recensions, but handy reports of the conclusions of the chief editors of recent years, two deserve mention: *The Resultant Greek Testament, exhibiting the Text in which the majority of Modern Editors are agreed, and containing the readings* of Stephens (1550), Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, Lightfoot, Ellicott, Alford, Weiss, the Bâle Edition (1880), Westcott and Hort and the Revision Committee, by R. F. Weymouth (3rd edition, London, 1905); *Novum Testamentum Graece cum apparatu critico ex editionibus et libris manu scriptis collecto* (Stuttgart, Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 7th edition, 1908), by Eberhard Nestle. The latter provides a text based on the agreement of Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and Weiss, or of any two of these three. Other features are a select critical apparatus, in which particular attention is paid to the readings of *Codex Bezae*; the Eusebian canons and sections; indications of parallel passages in other Gospels; paragraphs and Old Testament quotations specially marked as in Westcott and Hort. The same text is published in his centenary edition of the British and Foreign Bible Society (June 1904 and later), but, instead of the apparatus of the Stuttgart edition, this edition is provided with matter specially interesting to the English reader—namely, a conspectus of all the differences between the text printed and the Greek texts behind our Authorised and Revised Versions respectively. The text behind the Revised Version was published by E. Palmer (Oxford, 1881, and

later). What Palmer did was to substitute in the Stephanus text the alterations on which the revisers had agreed: the result is that old and new elements are both present. The sense, however, is not disturbed by this procedure, and the text has remained standard in the University of Oxford. In 1910 it was issued afresh with an up-to-date critical apparatus showing select variants, the work of the present writer, who had the advantage of Dr. Sanday's counsel and experience.

The Introduction to an edition which will probably not be long delayed has been provided by Freiherr Professor Hermann von Soden of the University of Berlin. In bulk this work far surpasses anything before attempted. The title of the first volume, containing this Introduction, all that is yet published, is *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt, hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte* ('The Writings of the New Testament in their oldest attainable form of text, established on the basis of their textual history').[1] Some account of the author's views will be found in a later chapter. Meantime, suffice it to say that far more minuscule MSS. have been examined for this work than for any other.

§ 2. Latin (especially Vulgate)

The earliest book printed from movable types was fittingly a Latin Bible. The work of Gutenberg, it was produced at Mainz (Mayence) on the Rhine between 1450 and 1453. It is often called the Mazarin Bible, after Cardinal Mazarin, who had all a Frenchman's love of *objets d'art*, and possessed a copy in his wonderful library. This edition is in double columns, with forty-two lines to the column.[2] About forty copies in all are known to have survived, but apparently only two, one at Munich and another at Vienna, are in an absolutely complete state.[3]

[1] Berlin, 1902—(May) 1910, pp. 2203, royal 8vo.

[2] Portions of the first issue have forty and forty-one lines to the column.

[3] Both Monsieur H. Welter (Paris), in March 1910, and the Insel-Verlag (Leipzig), in July 1910, have advertised a facsimile of this book. From the prospectuses I borrow the above particulars.

So far as I know, the edition has no special value from the textual critic's point of view. The early editions were all printed from ordinary manuscript Bibles of the thirteen or fourteenth century, of a type still existing in abundance.

This was followed by a multitude of editions, differing probably little from one another in text, for about a hundred and fifty years. Of these perhaps the most important are the following. Those of Robertus Stephanus, especially that of 1538-40; for this edition Stephanus used seventeen manuscripts, most of them of good quality and still identifiable, as well as three printed editions.[1] Another interesting edition is the Henten edition, published by Jean Henten of Mechlin at Louvain in 1547, and often later. Two other editions are of special interest to Roman Catholics: the Sixtine edition, published at Rome 1590, and the drastic revision of it called the Clementine issued two years later, also at Rome. This latter is the standard text of the Church of Rome, and will not soon be replaced. It has very often been reprinted, lastly and most conveniently by E. Nestle (Stuttgart, 1906, and later). These four editions are fairly representative of the older methods of editing. There have been attempts more or less systematic, within Romanism itself, to improve the official text, but no editor of the Roman Church has as yet issued a revised text.[2]

This has been reserved for the Church of England, which has done more than any other for biblical study from the very beginning of its long history. Dr. John WORDSWORTH, grandnephew of the poet and Bishop of Salisbury, with his colleague Professor Henry Julian WHITE of King's College, London, have with enormous labour produced an edition of the Gospels, Acts, and Romans (1889-1912),[3] based upon collations of some forty select MSS., and provided

[1] See the masterly identifications by Bishop Wordsworth, *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, i. (Oxford, 1883), pp. 47 ff.

[2] For a list of editions of the Vulgate, compare C. Vercellone's *Variae Lectiones*, i. pp. xcvi-civ and ii. pp. xxi-xxvi, and Wordsworth and White, *Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine*, pars prior (Oxon., 1889-98), pp. xxviii-xxxi, 721-24.

[3] *Romans* is not at the moment of writing actually published.

with a copious critical apparatus, with full introductions and appendix, dealing with all the fundamental questions. The Vatican in 1908 undertook a fresh critical recension of the Vulgate of the whole Bible, to be carried out by members of the Benedictine Order, under the editorship of Abbot Gasquet, Superior of the English Congregation: the work is proceeding steadily, and every confidence may be felt in the result.

Meantime, the British and Foreign Bible Society has followed its up-to-date Greek Testament with a handy critical edition of the Vulgate, with short apparatus, edited by Professor White.

Of the Old-Latin we have, of course, no complete uniform monument. The first printed edition of any part of an Old-Latin version was Dom Martianay's edition, published in 1695, of the Corbey St. James (*ff*), now at St. Petersburg, with other material. The Old-Latin version in all shapes and forms known at the time was worthily published in the truly monumental work of Dom Pierre SABATIER, published at Paris and Rheims in 1743. This work must still be consulted by all who desire as complete as possible an account of Old-Latin readings in any particular place. Much new evidence, and much purer evidence, has accrued since Sabatier's time, but to obtain it completely it is necessary to consult a host of volumes. It is understood that Herr Josef Denk of Munich has practically completed a new Sabatier, in which full account is taken of all evidence published since his time. Old-Latin texts of particular parts of Scripture have been published in various forms during the last century and a half, and a complete collection of these constitutes a small library in itself. The Oxford collection of OLD-LATIN BIBLICAL TEXTS, by Wordsworth, Sanday, White, and Buchanan, of which six volumes have been published, is the most notable published achievement in this field since Sabatier.[1]

[1] Vol. i. (*g* of Matthew); vol. ii. (*k* of Matthew-Mark, and many other Gospel fragments); vol. iii. (*q* of the Gospels); vol. iv. (*s* of Acts and Catholic Epistles); vol. v. (*ff*^{2} of Gospels and *h* of Acts, etc.); vol. vi. (*b* of Gospels). Vol. vii. will be the New Testament text of St. Irenaeus.

§ 3. Syriac

Of the Diatessaron in its present state the English reader will find a rendering in Hamlyn Hill's *Earliest Life of Christ* (last edition, Edinburgh, 1910), and in Ante-Nicene Christian Library, additional volume, ed. A. Menzies (Edinburgh, 1897).

The Old-Syriac text is best studied in F. C. Burkitt's *Evangelion da-Mepharreshê*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1904), and Mrs. Lewis's later edition (London, 1910).

The best edition of the Peshitta, for the Gospels, is Pusey and Gwilliam's, with literal Latin translation (Oxon., 1901). For the rest of the New Testament, the *editio princeps* of Widmanstadt (1555), or Schaaf's (Lugd. Bat., 1708-9, etc.) may be used. There is a handy edition published by the Bible Society.

Of the pure Philoxenian the four Catholic Epistles not in the Peshitta Canon have been published (*Remnants of the Later Syriac Versions of the Bible* (London, 1909)), and the Apocalypse (Dublin, 1897), both by Dr. John Gwynn. The Harclean Version should be read in the edition of Joseph White (Oxford, 1778-1803). A new edition is much wanted.

The fragments of the Palestinian (erroneously called the Jerusalem) Syriac must be sought in various publications. The chief is: 'The Palestinian Syriac Lectionary of the Gospels, re-edited from two Sinai MSS., and from P. de Lagarde's edition of the *Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum*,' by A. S. Lewis and M. D. Gibson (London, 1899).

§ 4. Egyptian

The Sahidic Version of the Gospels with exact English translation and abundant apparatus has been published by the Clarendon Press in three volumes, March 1911, edited by the Rev. G. W. Horner. Other parts of the New Testament must meantime be sought in Balestri's continuation of Ciasca's edition of fragments, vol. iii., and in various articles. A MS. of Acts is edited by Dr. Budge

in *Coptic Biblical Texts of the British Museum* (London, 1911).

The Bohairic Version of the New Testament was published by the Clarendon Press in four volumes, 1898 to 1905, edited by Mr. HORNER, with English translation, and full apparatus.

Fayyumic and other fragments must be sought in such publications as W. E. Crum, *Coptic MSS. brought from the Fayum*, Leipoldt, *Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Berliner Museen*, i. 5, and Gaselee in *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. xi. pp. 514 ff.

§ 5. GOTHIC

The surviving fragments of the version have been edited by Gabelentz and Loebe (1836-43). The handiest edition, which is also good, is that of Streitberg: *Die gotische Bibel herausgegeben von* Wilhelm Streitberg, Ier Teil (Heidelberg, 1908). This contains not only the text and its Greek original, but introductory and other material of value. Add, of course, the fragment above referred to, published by Glaue.[1] The Gospel of Mark has been edited by Professor Skeat (Oxford, 1882).

§ 6. ARMENIAN

Twenty manuscripts were used for the edition of Zohrab (Zohrap), published in 1789, and since reprinted by the Bible Society. A photographic edition of a ninth-century MS. containing the Gospels was published at Moscow in 1899. The best edition of the Apocalypse is that of Dr. F. C. Conybeare, *The Armenian Version of Revelation . . .* [with English translation]. (London, 1907.)

§ 7. ETHIOPIC

The first edition appeared at Rome in 1548 (1549), but it is said that neither it nor any later edition is satisfactory.

[1] See page 44.

The latest is J. Pell Platt's edition, revised by Fr. Prätorius (Leipzig, 1899).

§ 8. Georgian

The first edition, printed at Moscow in 1743, is susceptible of very great improvement, in view of the very considerable number of really old MSS. that have survived. Dr. F. C. Conybeare, in articles already mentioned,[1] has shown this as well as the interest of the version.

§ 9. Arabic

The Gospels were published by De Lagarde in 1864 from four manuscripts at Vienna. The earliest edition is dated Rome 1591.

[1] See page 74.

CHAPTER IX

PRINCIPLES OF CRITICISM, ETC.

In proceeding to edit a text, the future editor lays his foundations carefully. If the text has been already edited, he collects all the printed editions, and from the information given in them he makes a tentative list of manuscript authorities. The number of printed editions can be sensibly reduced by taking no account of those that are mere reprints of others. The editor's aim in studying previous editions is, of course, primarily to find out as much as he can of the manuscript bases behind them, and secondarily, to collect such emendations of a faulty text as may have been suggested by their editors. It is a fallacy to suppose that everything good in any old edition of any book must have been transmitted to its successors. But when the editor has collected all he can from printed sources his duty has not ended. He must study the catalogues of libraries containing manuscripts. Lists of these libraries and their catalogues are to be found, so far as Greek manuscripts are concerned, in Gardthausen's *Sammlungen und Cataloge griechischer Handschriften* (Leipzig, 1903), and, so far as Latin are concerned, in Weinberger's *Catalogus Catalogorum* (Vienna, 1901, and later). In cases where the catalogues of libraries are unpublished, the editor must either visit the libraries themselves or communicate with the librarians as to the presence of so-and-so text in their collections. When he has made his list of manuscripts as complete as possible, he ought to arrange them in chronological order, and, if possible, add the locality where each was written. When this has been

done, the first step towards collation and classification has been achieved. It is then the editor's duty to collate the MSS. in the order of their age, taking the oldest first. The reason for this procedure is that he may find a later one to be merely a copy of an older, and after some work on that later one he may be able to neglect it altogether. The external history of a MS. is most useful in confirming a theory of relationship between MSS. based on date and contents accurately ascertained.

Individual Manuscripts

We have seen in a general way what the purpose of textual criticism is. We now propose to consider *inter alia* some of the rules which may prove valuable in the restoration of corrupt texts. Two kinds of errors are to be found in manuscripts—first, accidental; second, intentional. The first kind are those due to defective copying, where the scribe has the will to copy exactly what is before him. The second is found where the scribe, either judging correctly that what is before his eyes is wrong, corrects the mistake after a fashion of his own, in order to make some sense; or misunderstanding what is before him through defective knowledge of the language or want of common sense, alters the text before him to a form which in his opinion conveys the right sense. The first kind of error thus often leads to the second. There is a well-known instance in Juvenal (*Satire* viii., line 148), where the correct text is undoubtedly

> ipse rotam adstringit sufflamine mulio consul
> ('the consul, a muleteer for the nonce, himself with drag-chain binds the wheel').

This was miscopied by a scribe, who wrote the little-known word *mulio* as *multo*, thus producing

> ipse rotam adstringit sufflamine multo consul,

a form not devoid of sense, but metrically wrong. Along

comes a scribe who knows the laws of metre, and corrects this unmetrical line to

ipse rotam adstringit multo sufflamine consul,

the form in which this line appeared in all printed editions till about a quarter of a century ago. Here an accidental error is patched up by an intentional alteration, and this latter deceives many generations. A similar instance occurs in the New Testament (Luke xix. 37). Here the original text is

περὶ πάντων ὧν εἶδον λέγοντες (so Syr. vet. only).

The next step is that a marginal δυνάμεων is supplied by a scribe to explain the indefinite ὧν. This form gets into the text in B: but all other MSS. correct the resulting error in grammar by altering πάντων to πασῶν.

The science of palæography has medicines to apply to the former disease, that of accidental errors in copying, but who shall cure the vagaries of the human mind, floundering from error into error? The remedies for accidental errors are various, according to the nature of these accidental errors. They may be classified as follows:

(1) *Wrong division of words.*—The correct text of a passage in the Pseudo-Augustinian *Quaestiones, CXIIII.*, § 6 (page 305, line 22, of my edition) is: *erubescunt enim palam inludi; turpia enim quae illic uice legis aguntur. . . .* In all the MSS. we find *inluditur pia.* An early editor struck out the *-tur* and ingeniously changed the *pia* to *piacula.* There is a well-known instance of wrong division in the MSS. of Seneca (Epistle 89, § 4) corrected by Madvig. MSS. (*philosophia*) *ipso nomine fatetur. quidam et . . .*, which ought to be *. . . fatetur quid amet* ('Philosophy by its very name confesses what it loves'). So in English: 'Have you seen *a bun dance* on the table?' etc. The New Testament apparatus supplies some examples: in 1 Tim. iii. 16 some authorities take ὁμολογουμένως as ὁμολογοῦμεν ὡς, and in 2 Tim. ii. 17 some take γάγγραινα as γάγγρα ἵνα.

(2) *Omission of syllables or words or lines.*—This is a very common type of error. We have already had an instance of the omission of a line (page 86). Words or syllables are most apt to be omitted if they are identical with or closely resemble words or syllables next them. If the syllables be identical, and one is omitted, this error is known as haplography. If the omission be due to the syllable having the same beginning as that next it, the error is said to be due to *homoeoarcton*; if to the possession of the same ending, it is called *homoeoteleuton*. A general term for the omission of a syllable, etc., from the point of view of the agent who omits, is *parablepsia*.

(3) *Repetition of syllables or words or lines.*—Not so common, but still not infrequent, is the wrong repetition of a syllable, word, or line. This error is known as dittography.

(4) *Transpositions of syllables.*—Of these examples will be found in Housman's *Manilius*, Book I. pages lvii ff.

(5) *Marginal glosses getting into the text.*—Luke xix. 37 (above) is an instance. This type of error is not nearly so frequent as was at one time supposed. It is an easy expedient in a difficult passage for an editor to suppose such an insertion. Certain manifestations of Dutch scholarship exercised on authors like Thucydides will occur to the classical scholar. An instance, however, of such a gloss may be taken from the Pseudo-Augustinian *Quaestiones, XLI.* init, where *videtur hic errasse in ista sententia; non est accipiendum quod dixit*, a marginal note in one MS., becomes part of the text in a whole family of MSS. Another instance, from the New Testament itself, will be found in 2 Tim iv. 19, where certain authorities add, from the *Acta Pauli*, the words, 'Lectra his wife and Simaea.' A kindred error is that whereby an omission noticed afterwards by the scribe, and placed in the lower or upper margin, with marks to indicate where the insertion should be made, is misunderstood by a later copyist. The words may thus be placed wrongly by him. There is a notable instance of this in the manuscript tradition of Lucan's

De Bello Ciuili, which serves as a means of classifying certain MSS.[1]

Families of Manuscripts

If the errors occurring in manuscripts are a barrier between us and the original text, they have a use all their own in the effort to attain that text. The old unscientific method of textual criticism was to construct the text from the consensus of the majority of witnesses. What nineteen out of twenty witnesses read must be right against that which is read by the twentieth. This erroneous method of criticism is corrected by the application of the principle of genealogy of manuscripts. Just as in the case of human beings we conclude relationship from the common possession of abnormalities, so do we in manuscripts. Our witnesses are very numerous, and it is obviously necessary to reduce their number if we can. As each manuscript is a copy of some other manuscript, and so on back to the original autograph, it is obvious that if we possess the immediate original from which any MS. was copied, the copy ceases to have any value for our purpose, unless it happens that the scribe had two manuscripts in front of him instead of one, and occasionally 'corrected' the one by the other. Then the manuscript represents two strains. This is an exceptional case, however, and we must always begin by supposing that one MS. only was before the scribe, and that he is making an honest effort to copy it exactly. Community of error is then the sole ground of relationship, and the greater that community the closer the relationship. Sometimes it is possible to see an error working its way through a long line of manuscripts. The presence of this error proves that a common ancestor of all contained it. To take a case familiar to me. The *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti CXXVII.* of 'Ambrosiaster' exists in eight old manuscripts, and one thirteenth-century manuscript, as well as some late MSS., which need not be considered here. Five of these old

[1] See Prof. W. B. Anderson in the *Classical Review*, xx. (1906), p. 357.

manuscripts exhibit a very long passage of *Quaest. CXV.* transposed from its proper place to a position in *Quaest. CXVIII.* The error is easy to detect. *Quaest. CXV.* concerns astrology, while *Quaest. CXVIII.* is about Job. In *Quaest. CXV.* we come upon a grammatical impasse, and in *Quaest. CXVIII.*, after some commendation of Job, we suddenly plunge into extraneous matter, concerned with astrology, but having nothing to do with Job. It is obvious that all copies showing this transposition come from a common ancestor, in which a sheet or two had become accidentally transposed. The other three old MSS. are without this transposition, but, as the absence of the transposition is not an error, this argues no close relationship between them. But all the eight have an *omission*, which does not appear in the thirteenth-century MS. Therefore the eight are, after all, related, and all come from some very ancient copy from which a leaf or two had been cut out or lost. In the effort to restore the original text, this one thirteenth-century MS. may be right at times, against the consensus of the eight much older MSS., as it represents a different strain; and, having one error in common, the eight may have others also, derived from their ultimate original. Within the five, too, one can classify. It can be proved that one of the five is a copy of another, and also that another pair are sister MSS. derived from a lost original. And all this indisputable classification is made possible by a close study of errors.[1]

This example has been chosen as an easily demonstrable case. Similar things happen in New Testament MSS. Whole classes of minuscules are constituted by those MSS. which exhibit the passage about the adulterous woman in certain positions. Similarly, one can classify authorities for the conclusions of St. Mark. But we cannot prove that one MS. is a direct copy of another, unless we can account for every aberration in the case of the later MS. We must always first prove relationship, but it takes more trouble

[1] See my paper in *Sitzungsberichte* of the Vienna Academy, cxlix. (1905), or my edition (Vienna, 1908), pp. xxviii ff.

to define it exactly, and we must postulate not infrequently the existence of missing links.

In the case of the New Testament, too, intentional alteration, mainly in the interests of clearness, rarely of a special theology,[1] plays a distinct part. In the Gospels, too, harmonisation between one Gospel and another, due perhaps sometimes to use of a formal Diatessaron, oftener probably to the fact that we are all liable to recollect Gospel passages 'diatessarically,' is often found. Obviously those authorities are to be followed in any particular Gospel which gives a reading not found in another Gospel. Where MSS. of two Gospels exhibit both readings, we must decide which belongs to which by a study of the general methods of each evangelist.

In deciding as to which of one or more readings is the correct one, the final judgment lies with the trained commonsense of the scholar. If it be replied that scholars differ, then the answer must be that for the untrained man the opinion held by most scholars, or by those whose judgment is most highly esteemed by the body of scholars themselves, is that which will be most safely followed. There can be little question that of all texts now in existence, that which commands the highest degree of assent among those best qualified to judge is that of Westcott and Hort. This is due not only to the almost infallible judgment of Hort in such matters, a scholar who also spared no pains to make an exhaustive examination of all the evidence in each case for himself, but is also due to the fact that two scholars threshed out the problems, and that in most cases they were able to come to an agreement, in spite of the fact that their investigations were independent. In this chapter, therefore, the principles of Westcott and Hort will be expounded. In this no slight is intended to the work of Hermann von Soden, who has since suggested a view different in some important particulars. In Westcott and Hort's case we have the result before us in their text,

[1] See Dr. Rendel Harris, *Side-Lights on New Testament Research*, pp. 29 ff.

and in Von Soden's the text is still awaited. Further, the abundance of Von Soden's material, and the forbidding manner in which it is presented, increase the difficulty of presenting his views. These, however, will be found, put as briefly as I can put them, at the end of the chapter. The absence of an exposition of the views of scholars earlier than Westcott and Hort will readily be excused in a brief work, especially as Westcott and Hort gathered up in themselves all that was most valuable in the work of their predecessors. The maxims which they enunciate on questions of text are of such importance that they must be reproduced here [1] :—

(*a*) Knowledge of documents should precede final judgment upon readings.

(*b*) All trustworthy restoration of corrupted texts is founded on the study of their history.

Application to New Testament Text

An epitome of Westcott and Hort's general view of the textual history of the New Testament may now follow.

The Antiochian Fathers, Diodorus of Tarsus and his two pupils, St. John (Chrysostom) and Theodore of Mopsuestia, attest the existence of abundance of various readings already before the fifth century. The Greek manuscripts of normal character show us for the most part an Antiochian or Graeco-Syrian text of the middle and end of the fourth century, after which date few variations of any importance appear to have been made.

(1) 'Syrian' readings are derived from 'Western' readings, and from other older readings. This appears from passages where mixed readings occur [2] :—

Mark ix. 3 :

(*a*) οἷα γναφεὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐ δύναται οὕτως λευκᾶναι, ℵ B, 1 and its allies, a few other miniscule MSS.,

[1] Introduction, pp. 31, 40.

[2] I have selected one example myself, the others I have borrowed from Westcott and Hort, pp. 95-104; but I have given the authorities for each reading with an accuracy impossible in 1881.

Old-Latin MSS. *d* and *k*, the Sahidic, Armenian, and Ethiopic versions.

(*b*) ὡς χιών, X (a minor Greek uncial), *a* and *n* representing the oldest known European type of Old-Latin, and the Old-Syriac (according to the Sinaitic palimpsest).

(*c*) ὡς χιὼν οἷα [γναφεὺς] ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐ δύναται οὕτως λευκᾶναι, D and the ruck of Greek MSS., the majority of Old-Latin MSS. and the Vulgate, the Peshitta, Syriac, and the Bohairic version (possibly also the Diatessaron). I bracket γναφεύς because it is omitted in D, *b* of the Old-Latin, and the Peshitta.

The (*a*) reading can be traced as far back as the middle of the third century by its presence in *k*, which, as we have seen, represents the Cyprianic Bible ; (*b*) can hardly be later in Latin than the same date, and if Burkitt's view of the Old-Syriac is right, must be half a century older in Syrian Antioch ; (*c*) there is no ground for regarding as earlier than the fourth century. We shall, therefore, naturally regard (*c*) as the later reading, having been made up by a conflation of the two earlier readings. To which of the latter we ought to give the preference is not now the question, but (*a*), as having old Eastern and Western attestation combined, is more likely to be right. The ' fuller ' was regarded as vulgar, and so (*b*) adopts the banal comparison with snow.

Mark ix. 38 :

(*a*) καὶ ἐκωλύομεν (or ἐκωλύσαμεν) αὐτόν, ὅτι οὐκ ἠκολούθει (or ἀκολουθεῖ) ἡμῖν (or μεθ' ἡμῶν), ℵ B C L Δ Ψ, four minuscules, the Old-Latin MS. *f*, the Old, Peshitta and Palestinian Syriacs, the Sahidic and Bohairic versions, some MSS. of the Armenian, the Ethiopic.

(*b*) ὃς οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν (or μεθ' ἡμῶν) καὶ ἐκωλύομεν (or ἐκωλύσαμεν) αὐτόν, D X, 1 and its family, 13 and its family, 28,700 and a few other min-

uscules, all the Old-Latin MSS. but one, as well as the Vulgate, the margin of the Harclean Syriac, some MSS. of the Armenian.

(*c*) ὃς οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν καὶ ἐκωλύσαμεν αὐτόν, ὅτι οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν, the great mass of Greek MSS., the Harclean Syriac and the Gothic versions.

The reading (*c*) cannot be traced earlier than the second half of the fourth century, the date of the Gothic version, but the attestation of (*a*) is both old and wide. The reading (*b*) is also old and predominantly Western in the geographical sense. It can hardly be doubted that both (*a*) and (*b*) are at least as old as the second century, and it seems plain that (*c*) is a conflation of (*a*) and (*b*), on the usual principle that nothing be lost.

Luke xxiv. 53 :

(*a*) εὐλογοῦντες, ℵ B, first hand of C, L, the Old and Palestinian Syriacs, the Sahidic and Bohairic versions.

(*b*) αἰνοῦντες, D, the Old-Latin version, Augustine.

(*c*) αἰνοῦντες καὶ εὐλογοῦντες, A, second hand of C, great mass of Greek manuscripts, the Latin Vulgate, the Peshitta and Harclean Syriacs, the Armenian, and practically the Ethiopic version.

None of the evidence for (*c*) can be dated earlier than the fourth century (the date of the Latin Vulgate), but (*a*) and (*b*) are both old. It is quite clear that (*c*) is a conflation of (*a*) and (*b*), or rather of (*b*) and (*a*), for here, just as above, it appears that the Syrian-Antiochian text was made with the Western text for base, as we should expect,[1] the variants of Alexandrian MSS. being added from a copy at the reviser's side.

Another example may be added here, though it is too complicated to be merely a simple illustration of the truth we are seeking to establish.

[1] The Western text was in prevalent use in Syria down to about the middle of the fourth century.

John vi. 69 :

(*a*) ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ, ℵ B C D L, the Sahidic version, and the writers Nonnus and Cosmas, both Alexandrians, of the fifth and sixth centuries respectively.

(*b*) ὁ χριστὸς ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ, certain MSS. of the Sahidic version, and most of the Bohairic.

(*c*) ὁ χριστός, Tertullian.

(*d*) ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, *b* of the Old-Latin, and the Curetonian MS. of the Old-Syriac.

(*e*) ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, 1 and its group, 33,565, *e* of the Old-Latin and other MSS., as well as the Vulgate, the Sinaitic palimpsest of the Old-Syriac, certain manuscripts of the Bohairic version, and Cyril of Alexandria (as edited).

(*f*) ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος, 17, and Cyprian in two quotations of the verse which he makes.

(*g*) ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος, N and the ruck of the Greek MSS., ff_2 and *q*, two later Old-Latin European MSS., the Peshitta and Harclean Syriac, the Gothic, etc., also Basil, Chrysostom, and Victorinus Afer in two quotations made by him.[1]

At first sight the multiplicity of the evidence is bewildering here, but several considerations will help to clear the air. One is the influence of parallelism. This passage was certain to be confused with the confession of Peter. If we can ascertain the precise text of that, it will help to eliminate interpolation. In the Matthaean form it is identical with (*g*), which at once disposes of (*g*)'s claim to be regarded as the correct text in John. A second maxim which may help us to decide, is the rule that a shorter reading is more likely to be right than a longer ; by this canon (*a*), (*c*), and (*d*) would have the best claim to be considered original. The third is the old maxim of Bengel, *proclivi lectioni praestat ardua.* By this maxim (*a*) easily carries off the victory; (*g*) is the Syrian-Antiochian

[1] Compare also Mark i. 2 ; viii. 26.

reading, as we cannot date its attestation earlier than the fourth century.

(2) The writings of the ante-Nicene Fathers show that Syrian-Antiochian readings are later than Western and other older readings and Alexandrian readings. Traces of a Syrian-Antiochian text cannot be found before the middle of the third century, yet Western and other readings are found everywhere.

It is possible that good critical texts might push the evidence for Syrian-Antiochian readings a good deal later than the middle of the third century. The texts of the Greek Fathers are so badly preserved that it is highly probable that many, if not all, Syrian-Antiochian readings found in modern texts of the Fathers are due to the scribes, who must have been familiar with the ecclesiastical text above all others, in most cases perhaps exclusively so. In illustration of the truth of this (2) principle, a critical study of the quotations in Greek Fathers down to and including Origen, reveals no certain instances of Syrian-Antiochian readings. We have seen, for instance, that Marcion, Justin, Tatian, Irenaeus, Clement, and Hippolytus used 'Western' texts. Origen is also generally on the same side, but shows occasional knowledge of what Westcott and Hort call the Neutral text. A good example is *διασάφησον* with ℵ B (Matth. xiii. 36), where all other Greek authorities have *φράσον*. Even later, in Methodius and Eusebius, the Western text still rules.

(3) The character of the Syrian-Antiochian readings themselves shows that they are later than Western, Alexandrian, and other readings.

This has been shown by our study of various passages above. The author or authors of the Syrian revision had before them, at least, three types of text—a Western, a 'Neutral,' and an Alexandrian. They made their revision out of these three, with the Western text, as the present writer thinks, for their usual base.[1] 'Where they found variation, they followed different procedures in different

[1] See above, p. 120.

places. Sometimes they transcribed unchanged the reading of one of the earlier texts, now of this, now of that. Sometimes they in like manner adopted exclusively one of the readings, but modified its form. Sometimes they combined the readings of more than one text in various ways, pruning or modifying them if necessary. Lastly, they introduced many changes of their own where, so far as appears, there was no previous variation.' [1]

From all this it results that readings clearly Syrian-Antiochian are to be rejected, and that readings in which pre-Syrian texts agree among themselves are to be accepted as original. Where they are in disagreement it is more difficult to decide what is the original text. The Western text is on the whole distinguished by additions not required by the sense, and by a paraphrastic tendency (if, of course, we regard the non-Western as nearer the original). The tendency of these alterations is to make the text simpler to understand. Another tendency of the Western text is to harmonise parallel passages, especially in the Gospels. So much is this a characteristic of D, the leading Greek representative of the Western text in the Gospels, that Vogels has argued that the text is powerfully influenced by the Diatessaron.[2] This fact in itself is enough to prove that the Western text as we have it cannot be the original apostolic text. Nor is the Western text itself a unity. There are distinct signs of an Eastern branch represented especially by the Old-Syriac, in addition to the Western branch represented by D, the Diatessaron, and the European Old-Latin versions. But of course these two groups frequently agree. The 'Western' texts may be described as due to increasing free handling of the apostolic originals. Sometimes one branch agrees with the 'Neutral' authorities, while the other branch is specifically 'Western' in character. They merit the utmost attention, because they are the oldest attested, but careful study is required to detach from them the gradual accretions of a century or

[1] W. H., *Introd.*, pp. 116 f.
[2] *Texte und Untersuchungen*, Dritte Serie, Bd. vi. (1910).

more. Evidence for another type of text in the ante-Nicene period comes almost exclusively from Alexandria, from Clement and Origen particularly. The Alexandrian Church was isolated from the rest of Christendom during the first century and a half or so of its existence. There was also there an old tradition of scholarly pursuits and accuracy, which would conduce to the careful preservation of literary texts. There, too, the Septuagint, the Bible of the early Christians, had taken its rise. What more natural than that the new sacred books should be carefully copied there? The universal diffusion of the Western text can be best explained by the view that it circulated from Rome, the capital, and the centre of all things. There is ample evidence that Rome used the Western text. But Egypt was practically a closed country to the rest of the Empire, the centre of the corn supply, a special preserve of the Empire, not to be visited by any one save with the emperor's express permission. There, then, a text would be preserved in more primitive purity than elsewhere. The Western documents themselves, however, show that at one time the Neutral text must have been more widely spread.

The name 'Alexandrian' is applied by Westcott and Hort to certain varieties in pre-Syrian non-Western texts. These variations are found in quotations of Origen and Cyril of Alexandria, as well as in the two leading Egyptian versions, especially the Bohairic. These variations would appear to have had their origin in Alexandria, and to belong to a partially degenerate form of pre-Syrian non-Western text. The changes are more those of language than of matter, and aim at greater correctness of phrase.

The Syrian-Antiochian revision, which may have been due to Lucian of Antioch, martyred in 312, is distinguished by fulness and smoothness. As Constantinople was ecclesiastically the child of Antioch, this text became the current ecclesiastical text, reproduced by the great mass of the cursives. A certain proportion of cursives exhibit a text degenerate even from this, but others preserve

precious fragments here and there of really old texts, now no longer represented by uncials.

After expounding this history of the text in the early centuries, Westcott and Hort proceed to enumerate the surviving documents in which the various types are preserved in a greater or less degree of purity.

Pre-Syrian of no family

B in Gospels, Acts, Catholic Epistles, in Paul has here and there Western readings.

ℵ to a great extent, but there are very many Western readings, especially in John, and very many Alexandrian readings.

Less matter, but of great value, is preserved in the Gospels by L and some other uncials. In the other parts of the New Testament C and A have preserved much, in Acts 61, and in Paul H and M. Some MSS. have slighter traces.

Western

D (Gospels and Acts), D (Paul), G (Paul) (and its closely related F) are alone, with the chief Old-Latin MSS. and Fathers, the Old-Syriac version, and the Greek (non-Alexandrian) Ante-Nicene Fathers, pure, but many Western readings are found in many MSS.:

Gospels: ℵ X Γ 1 &c 13 &c 22 28 81 (especially) 157 Latin and Syriac Vulgate (or any Syrian text), Sahidic, Armenian, Gothic and Ethiopic versions.

Acts: ℵ E 137 180, etc., Latin and Syriac Vulgate, Harclean Syriac (especially), Sahidic, Armenian, Ethiopic versions. Quotations in Irenaeus.

Paul: ℵ B 31 37 137, Latin Vulgate, Syriac versions, Sahidic, Armenian, Gothic (especially), Ethiopic.

Alexandrian

Hardly a pure witness remains, but many traces are found in a number of MSS. of the better class, especially

in Acts and Catholic Epistles; also in the Sahidic and Bohairic versions, especially the latter; further, in the Armenian, the Latin Vulgate (or another revised Latin text), the Alexandrian Fathers.

Gospels: ℵ C L X 33, also 157.
Acts: ℵ A C E, etc.
Catholic Epistles: ℵ A C P, etc.
Paul: ℵ A C P, etc.

Syrian

Witnesses almost pure are the majority of minuscules, as well as the later uncials. In the old,[1] Peshitta, and Harclean Syriac versions the Syrian text is especially present, but all the versions from the fourth century onwards are more or less Syrian in text, among which Latin MSS. like *f* and *q* and the Gothic version are prominent.

Gospels: The majority of MSS. (A C N X K M Γ Δ mix ancient matter sparingly with Syrian).
Acts: The majority of MSS.
Catholic Epistles: The majority of MSS. (P to a great extent).
Paul: The majority of MSS. (P to a great extent).

The older texts of the Apocalypse they could not distinguish with sufficient clearness.

Such in brief is the general scheme of Westcott and Hort's classification of the authorities for the text of the New Testament. The thirty years which have elapsed since the publication of their edition have been characterised rather by an increase in the number of available documents and a more accurate knowledge of those then available than by any real advance in our knowledge of the history of the text. The effect of the thirty years' work has been rather to fill in the details of the picture they sketched than to obliterate certain parts and sketch

[1] By this of course is meant, in the mouths of Westcott and Hort, the type of text offered by the Curetonian Syriac MS.

them anew. The advance in knowledge of documents has been triple. Three columns, as it were, have been simultaneously advancing on the citadel. Greek MSS., versions (with their manuscripts), and patristic quotations (with the manuscripts containing them) are all more accurately known. I have tried in a recent paper to outline the principal elements in this advance so far as the Gospels are concerned.[1] It is there, of course, that the main interest of the present age lies. But progress has been made in other parts of the New Testament also, notably in Acts and in the Apocalypse.

The most important document which has accrued during the period is unquestionably the Sinaitic Syriac Palimpsest, discovered in 1892. As representing for the most part an earlier form of the Old-Syriac version than the Curetonian MS., and supplying many of its defects, it shed a flood of light on the early history of the 'Western' text, and has strengthened the authority for many readings. Hardly second in importance is the Freer Greek MS. of the Gospels expected to be. Dated variously by experts, it can hardly be earlier than the fourth century or later than the sixth, and it is already known that it contains certain unique or almost unique features. Next in interest comes, perhaps, our increased knowledge of the purple MSS. of the Gospels, allied to one another textually as well as artistically. In the Epistles of Paul we have to chronicle the increased knowledge of MS. H, with its interesting bearing on the early history of the text. Among cursives, Mr. Hoskier's collation of No. 700 (604) in the British Museum deserves mention, as supplying a very interesting text, with many early elements. Lake's study of the 1 group, and the light he and others have shed on the 13 or Ferrar group, have shown in practical working that study of families of minuscules which has been carried so far later by Hermann von Soden and his collaborators.[2] B. Weiss and W. Bousset have also made

[1] *Progress in the Textual Criticism of the Gospels since Westcott and Hort*, in *Mansfield College Essays* (London, 1909), pp. 349-64.

[2] See also E. A. Hutton's *Atlas of Textual Criticism* (Cambridge, 1911), pp. 49 ff., for an interesting analysis of Ferrar readings.

laudable attempts to classify MSS. in the Epistles and Apocalypse respectively.

The study of the versions has also been signally promoted. The University of Oxford, in *Old-Latin Biblical Texts* and the Vulgate of Bishop Wordsworth and Professor White, has done more than any other university in the world to promote increased knowledge of the Latin documents, though other scholars like Berger, Heer, and Hoskier deserve mention for their editions or collations of Latin MSS. In the department of Syriac, the Old-Syriac palimpsest, edited both by Burkitt and Mrs. Lewis, deserves the foremost place, but the edition of the Peshitta Gospels by Pusey and Gwilliam must not be overlooked. Dr. Gwynn's excellent editions of the Philoxenian Syriac in the minor Catholic Epistles and in the Apocalypse are Ireland's great contribution to the subject. The Harclean revision for part of Hebrews has been recovered and edited by Bensly. Editions of several fresh manuscripts of the Palestinian Syriac Lectionary are to the credit of Harris, Mrs. Lewis, and others. Rev. G. W. Horner has edited the Sahidic version of the Gospels in the most masterly fashion, and has given us a no less valuable edition of the Bohairic version of the entire New Testament. The Armenian versions of the Apocalypse have been first made readily accessible to all by Dr. F. C. Conybeare. To the same scholar also is due further knowledge of the Georgian version; nor have the Arabic versions been neglected. It is pardonable if we should boast in such services to the sacred text, unmatched in any other country.

The period has also been marked by the publication of many better editions of patristic works. Nothing in the work of Westcott and Hort is perhaps more praiseworthy than the patience and wisdom which they employed in dealing with the early and bad editions of Fathers, which in so many cases were all they had at their disposal. The Berlin series of Greek Fathers, started in 1897, is a noble attempt to represent, often on the basis of poorly preserved material, the authentic texts of many patristic writings.

For the period later than Nicaea we have received such editions as Mr. E. O. Winstedt's *Cosmas Indicopleustes*, most interesting for the history of the New Testament text. In Latin the progress has been more remarkable, not because greater scholars have worked at the Latin patristic writings, but because the evidence is in most cases so much better preserved. There exists in the libraries of Europe probably enough material to write an illuminating history of the Latin Bible from about 300 or 350 onwards to modern times. The Vienna *Corpus* of Latin ecclesiastical writers endeavours to supply critical texts of all writings down to about 600. Outside this scheme we have such valuable works as Swete's *Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Epistles of Paul*, Burkitt's *Rules of Tyconius*, and Burn's *Niceta of Remesiana*, each provided with information on the biblical text employed by the author. Oriental writers, too, are receiving attention in the *Patrologia Orientalis*, and other works, to which such work as the Mechitarist's edition of St. Ephraim on the Epistles of Paul, despite its defects, deserves to be added.

The study of the materials has made a considerable advance also. No scholar has done more for our comprehension of the whole of the evidence than Professor F. C. Burkitt, whose services to the study of the Latin and Syriac versions are equally great. By his convincing dating of the Peshitta in Rabbula's period (411-35), he has solved the most desperate problem which the defenders of the Neutral text had to face. His strong championship of the view that by *Itala* Augustine in the famous passage meant no more than the then new Hieronymian work, the Vulgate, has paved the way for a simpler classification of Old-Latin texts. The readers of the present work would do well to ponder every word he writes on the subject of New Testament textual criticism, for no authority of our time surpasses him in learning and judgment. Another feature of our period has been the way in which study of the Synoptic problem and that of the textual criticism of the Gospels have played into one another's hands. Of this

perhaps the most interesting illustration is to be found in Mr. C. H. Turner's articles.[1] No more historically important study of Latin material has appeared than Dr. Sanday's analysis of the *k*-Cyprianic text of the Gospels.[2] The numerous monographs of Dr. Rendel Harris, too, in which with curious learning and bright flashes of genius he has illuminated many an obscure corner of our field, are one of the most delightful features of the period. Many other interesting pieces of work must be passed over in silence to make way for the epoch-making introduction of Hermann von Soden.

Between the years 1902 and 1910 Von Soden, with the aid of numerous collaborators, has published over two thousand large pages of introductory matter, most of it in small type, expounding his view of the history of the text. The text itself is still unpublished. Some account of this first volume must here be given, and I am indebted to the review and appendix of Professor Lake for help in doing so.[3]

In this volume he has discussed three topics :—

(1) The notation and enumeration of MSS.

(2) The classification of MSS. into groups according to their textual characteristics.

(3) The reconstruction of the history of the text.

(1) *The New Notation.*—The MSS. of the earliest period never contained the whole New Testament. The New Testament was commonly in four volumes : (1) the fourfold Gospel, (2) Acts and Catholic Epistles, (3) Paul, (4) Apocalypse. The old notation dealt with each of these volumes as a separate entity, and if a particular Greek MS. contained more than one of these four sections, it could bear a different number (or letter) in the list of MSS.

[1] Three articles in vol. x. (1908-9) of the *Journal of Theological Studies*, especially pp. 174 ff.

[2] *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, ii. (Oxford, 1886). See also Hans von Soden, *Das lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur Zeit Cyprians* (Leipzig, 1909).

[3] *Review of Theology and Philosophy*, Oct. and Nov. 1908, separately published also; Lake, *Text of N. T.*, 4th ed. (Dec. 1908). Cf. also Nestle, *Einführung*[3] (March 1909), 197 ff., and Valentine Richards, *Cambridge Biblical Essays* (Oct. 1909), 535 ff.

of each of the sections. Thus a Greek manuscript which contained the whole New Testament had a different number attached to it in each of the four classes, though it remained the same complete MS. The letters and numbers, as we have seen, became attached to MSS. from the time of Wettstein (1761-2), and the capital letters of the alphabet were employed to designate uncial MSS. in the order in which they became known to editors of the New Testament, in the same way as the numbers were employed to indicate the minuscule MSS. Thus the accident that *Codex Alexandrinus* was known before any other uncial led to the use of A to indicate it; and similarly the number 1 was used to indicate a Basle MS., because it was used by Erasmus, the editor of the first published edition. This system was continued by later editors such as Scholz, who simply added the new manuscripts they collated to the previous existing list, attaching to them the succeeding numbers. Von Soden's system ignores the artificial distinction between uncials and minuscules, renumbers all the manuscripts, and endeavours to show at once by the symbol and number, to those who have grasped his system, the contents and date of the manuscript concerned. Thus a manuscript which contains the whole New Testament (with or without the Apocalypse) is at once known as such by the symbol δ (=διαθήκη) preceding the new number, and one containing the Gospel only by ε (=εὐαγγέλιον) so prefixed; so with π (πράξεις) for Acts and Catholic Epistles (with or without the Apocalypse), and α (ἀπόστολος) for Paul. The number attached contains in it one figure which suggests the century to which the MS. belongs. 'δ- and α-MSS., up to the end of the ninth century, are numbered 1 to 49; those of the tenth century 50 to 99; for the following centuries numbers of three ciphers are taken, and the cipher in the hundreds' place indicates the century: thus, 121 means a MS. of the eleventh century, 221 of the twelfth, 321 of the thirteenth, and so on.'[1] Further parti-

[1] Lake, *Text of the New Testament*, 4th ed. (1908), p. 100.

culars of this ingenious system need hardly be given here, especially as the use of it is likely to be confined to the inventor's own edition. However important it may be for the professional scholar to be able to tell questions of date and contents at a glance, the main practical object of the use of symbols indicating manuscripts is the resulting brevity of a critical apparatus. An apparatus employing the full Von Soden symbols would be unduly cumbrous. The revised system of Gregory, which retains all that is good and familiar in the old system, while it removes such anomalies as it had, is much better, and the vast majority of experts have expressly declared their preference for it.[1]

(2) *The Classification of MSS.*—Von Soden classifies MSS. of the Gospels in groups, according to their general textual character, the form of the text of the *pericope adulterae* (which he calls μ [$=\mu\text{οιχαλίς}$]), and the chapter divisions, etc., attached to them. He distinguishes seven different recensions of μ, and tries to classify MSS. containing it on the basis of these different recensions. It is obvious, of course, that a copyist might derive μ from a different MS. from that which he used in making a copy of the rest of the Gospels. It is also obvious that chapter divisions might be used for a different form of text from that for which they were originally made. Copies of the Vulgate, for instance, often contain a system of chapter divisions and headings clearly made for an Old-Latin MS. Still Von Soden's method is good as far as it goes.

Using these criteria, he divides MSS. of the Gospels into three great groups, which he calls *K*, *H*, *I*, of which K and I may be divided into several smaller groups.

The *K* ($=\kappa\text{οινή}$) TEXT.—This he divides into five classes, of which K^1 is the oldest and best form, though it can in a few cases be corrected by the other families, which have sometimes preserved the original *K* text. K^1 omitted μ altogether, or marked it with asterisks to indicate its doubtful origin. From all these classes the original *K* text

[1] The first apparatus in which it has been used is my own.

is reconstructed. Its oldest MS. is eighth-century Ω (ε 61), but its influence can be traced as far back as A (δ 4) and C (δ 3), that is fifth century, and even in B (δ^1) ℵ (δ^2) (fourth century). *K* was used also by Chrysostom, and a mixture of *I* and *K* was used by the Cappadocian Fathers, whose Gospel text is preserved in the purple MSS., already referred to. *K* was produced at Antioch by Lucian († 312). This *K* text is practically the Syrian-Antiochian text of Westcott and Hort.

The *H* (=Ἡσύχιος) TEXT.—This text is found in eleven MSS. of varying degrees of purity, B ℵ C Ψ 33 Z L Δ 892 1241 579, and a few fragments, some very early and on papyrus. There is no very intimate connexion between any two of these MSS. except between the first and second, which were both produced in Egypt, and represent a common original, despite their numerous divergences. Even this common original has been contaminated by the Egyptian versions, and sometimes by the *K* and *I* texts, and by Origen, though not to any great extent. B is the better of the two, as ℵ has been corrupted in various ways. Von Soden refrains from subdividing the MSS. of this recension into families. It is more difficult to construct the original text of *H* than of *K*: there are many doubtful passages. The origin of the *H* text is unquestionably Egyptian, as it was used by the translators of the Egyptian versions, and by all the Egyptian writers after the end of the third century, but not by Clement or Origen. It is probably the recension made by Hesychius, of which Jerome makes mention. It represents Westcott and Hort's Neutral and Alexandrian texts. It is here that one of the main divergences between the two editors is to be found, and the question whether the two texts ought after all to be separated will have to be thoroughly threshed out.

The *I* (=Ἱεροσόλυμα) TEXT.—This text roughly corresponds to Westcott and Hort's Western text, but it depends entirely on Greek MSS. Von Soden practically ignores the Old-Latin and Old-Syriac versions at this point, but his

position is that there was a text-recension, which he calls *I*, made at a time later than the great versions—in fact, early in the fourth century. This text is really a recension of what Westcott and Hort understand by the Western text. It is found nowhere in a pure form, and Von Soden has been forced to identify in all eleven sub-groups of MSS., as well as to call attention to a number of isolated MSS. which cannot be fitted into any group. Among the groups are the 1-118-131-209 group previously mentioned, and the so-called Ferrar group, now extended to ten, to which he applies the symbol *J*. Most, if not all, of the Ferrar group were written in South Italy, not earlier than the twelfth century. This group is a good witness to the *I* text, though somewhat corrupted. Another group he calls II, which contains four purple MSS. of the sixth century (see above on the *K* text). They represent a mixture of *I* with K^1, and probably K^x. The *I* text is best preserved in DΘ (=ε-050) 28, 372, 565, 700 and a few others, but D is largely corrupted by influences from the Latin and Syriac (perhaps also Sahidic) versions. After eliminating corruptions the *I* text can be reconstructed. It seems to have been used by Eusebius of Caesarea and Cyril of Jerusalem. It is the recension made by Origen, and published by Pamphilus and Eusebius in Palestine.

Von Soden then proceeds to discuss the relative importance of *I*, *H*, and *K*, and to elaborate a theory to account for their existence. Out of the three recensions, when restored to their primitive purity, he would reconstruct the *I-H-K* text, which he considers to represent the original text of the Gospels. These three recensions agree in the main, and it is only in Mark that the differences are at all striking. In deciding which of two or more competing readings is correct, the chief criterion is the absence of harmonisation with a parallel passage in another Gospel. Of the three recensions *K* diverges most from *I-H-K*, and *I* least. The text used by Origen is earlier than all these recensions, but we possess no manuscript giving it in full. From the readings surviving in his commentaries Von

Soden infers that it was the *I-H-K* text which he used, but he did not construct it, and often disagrees with it. Origen is, in fact, an equal authority with *I-H-K* in textual criticism.

He then examines in succession all the texts, versions, and citations which seem to be older than, or independent of, these three recensions, and notes their differences from these recensions. These differences he attributes to the influence of Tatian's Diatessaron. But Tatian himself made his mosaic out of the *I-H-K* text, with variations which are not really variations. Further back than this he cannot go. The real weakness of this hypothesis is double. First, we have not more than fragments of the original Diatessaron, and these come to us through the double medium of Syriac and Armenian. The hypothesis is thus very hard to test. Second, there is no evidence that the Diatessaron had any real vogue except in the region of Syrian Antioch and in the Assyrian Church, and, this being the case, the rôle attributed to it is rather a serious one. Still it may have exercised some influence, though the view is now impossible of verification. The theory of various forms of Western text, backed up by careless citation and loose harmonisation in early versions and writers, would perhaps meet the requirements of the case even better.

Thus far we have been concerned with the Gospels only, but substantially the same theory is applied to explain the characteristics of the documentary authorities for the text of the rest of the New Testament. In these parts, of course, there is no Diatessaron to explain divergences in patristic quotation. In the Book of Acts also there are *I*, *H*, and *K* recensions. Of these three the *H* text undoubtedly stands relatively nearer to the original text than do the others. Of the authorities for the *H* text B and ℵ are the best, but neither is very good. Most of the authorities for this recension are contaminated with the *I* and *K* branches. The *H* type is found in the Egyptian writers Athanasius, Didymus, and Cyril of Alexandria, as well as

in the Bohairic and Sahidic versions. The *I* recension is best preserved in MSS. D and E. It can also be traced in Eusebius, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Epiphanius, though their citations are few. Von Soden is far from blind to the difficulties of his theory as applied to the text of Acts, and indeed the sections in which he deals with this part of his subject are among the very best of his whole treatment.[1] It is impossible, however, to epitomise them in the space at our disposal.

The Book of Acts was from an early date bound up with the Catholic Epistles, and manuscripts which contain both always display an uniform type of text. In other words, we do not find one type of text of Acts in conjunction now with one type in the Catholic Epistles, and now with another. Here again, therefore, Von Soden finds his three recensions *I*, *H*, and *K*. Yet, of course, prior to the union of Acts and Catholic Epistles, each of the eight items must have had some separate history, with the possible exception of Second and Third John. If proof of this were necessary, it would be found in the insecure canonical position of all in the list except Acts, First Peter, and First John.

Further, the manuscripts of the Epistles of St. Paul divide themselves into three classes representing respectively the *I*, *H*, and *K* recensions. Each of these had the Pastoral Epistles and the Epistle to the Hebrews as integral parts of its collection of Pauline Epistles. The total number of variants is relatively much smaller than in any other section of the New Testament, or, in other words, the manuscript tradition was more uniform. Athanasius and Cyril of Alexandria, as well as the Sahidic and Bohairic versions, use the *H* type, Eusebius and Cyril of Jerusalem use the *I* type, Theodoret and (in general) Chrysostom, as well as the Peshitta, use the *K* type. The Harclean Syriac follows also for the most part the *K* type, but not so accurately as does the Peshitta. If any of the two recensions share a reading against the third, that reading was more

[1] §§ 383-448 (pp. 1653-1840).

widespread in the third century, and must therefore represent the *I-H-K* text behind the three recensions. The readings given by the third against the two others, especially if that third be either *I* or *K*, are for the most part due to harmonisation with parallel passages. Von Soden admits that in writers earlier than these recensions readings occur different from *I-H-K*, which have claims to be regarded as genuine.[1] He remarks on the uniformity of the Greek text behind all our Latin authorities.[2] It is probable that a large part of what is individual in *K*, or in the European Latin, or in both together, is due to Marcion's text.

In the Apocalypse, also, there are three types of text. The *H* and *K* recensions can be clearly distinguished. The *H* recension is supported by the Bohairic version. The oldest MS. of the *K* recension is of the eighth century;[3] hence it is not impossible that that recension was of very late origin. The third recension is more closely related to *H* than it is to *K*. It is found in a pure state only in the commentary of Andreas of Cappadocia (saec. vi.), and it is possible that Andreas was himself the author of it. Harmonisation of parallel passages is its leading characteristic. It is frequently a matter of great difficulty to decide on the right reading of the Apocalypse text. The Latin versions and the Philoxenian Syriac have the same Greek text behind them as is to be found behind the three Greek recensions; the same is true of the citations in Hippolytus and Origen.

No account, least of all a brief one like the present, could do anything like justice to the comprehensiveness of Von Soden's investigations, but we must leave them for the present.

[1] § 508 ff. (pp. 1993 ff.).

[2] It is strange that the Victorinus Afer and Ambrosiaster texts should be absolutely ignored on p. 2012.

[3] *a* 1070 (Tisch. B. Greg. 046), Rome Vat. Gr. 2066. On page 245 Von Soden dates it tenth century, on page 2042 he dates it eighth!

CHAPTER X

THE FUTURE OUTLOOK

It appears to the present writer that a great advance upon the text of Westcott and Hort in the direction of the original autographs is highly improbable, at least in our generation. If they have not said the last word, they have at least laid foundations which make it comparatively simple to fit later discoveries into their scheme. The discovery of further materials will no doubt sometimes incline the balance towards the reading which, on deliberate inspection of the evidence available to them, Westcott and Hort rejected, or put into the margin. The support for some of these rejected readings has materially increased with the progress of discovery. For instance, the addition of the words καὶ τῆς νύμφης in Matt. xxv. 1 has now received the support of the Old-Syriac version, and is therefore proved to be 'Western' in the widest, and not merely in the geographical, sense. The omission of the words by the majority of authorities can be explained either as an omission of what was deemed superfluous, or as a confusion of the parable by the introduction of extraneous matter irrelevant to the similitude of the Bridegroom, Jesus Himself, on whom attention is to be concentrated. Luke xix. 37 has been already referred to (pp. 22, 113). John i. 41 has been illuminated by the application of a reagent to the Sinaitic Syriac. It, along with certain Old-Latin MSS., reads πρωΐ (early, in the morning) there, instead of πρῶτον, and it is easy to explain how πρῶτον and then πρῶτος arose, if we assume that πρωΐ was the original reading.[1]

[1] Cf. Mrs. Lewis in the *Expository Times*, Feb. 1909; A. Souter, *ibid.*, April 1909; J. H. Moulton, *ibid.*, May 1909; Mrs. Lewis's introduction to her 1910 edition of the Palimpsest, p. xli.

Nor can there, I think, be any doubt that in John viii. 34 we ought now to strike out the words τῆς ἁμαρτίας (of sin), and render 'Every one that doeth sin is a slave.' The omission is supported by D, *b* of the Old-Latin, the Old-Syriac, Clement of Alexandria twice, Cyprian, and by the later Western authors, Faustinus, Gregory of Elvira (twice), and St. Patrick. No Western reading has better support than this, and τῆς ἁμαρτίας is easily explained as an addition made in the interests of clearness. The fact that at the same time the force of the passage is destroyed would not trouble a reviser. The same thing has happened in Eph. iii. 14, where the intentional assonance between πατέρα and πατριά is obscured by the theologically unimpeachable insertion τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Again, it seems that in John xi. 25 there is a good deal to be said for the omission of καὶ ἡ ζωή, supported as it is by two Old-Latin MSS. as well as the Old-Syriac version, and citations in Cyprian and Titus of Bostra. The precious truth that Jesus is the Life also is still preserved in chap. xiv. 6, and the addendum in xi. 25 is natural and innocent. The Apocalypse is full of such instances, which are gradually being detected. The text of Scripture was subjected to such harmless explanatory additions.

One part of the theory of Westcott and Hort, which has received much attention, must be referred to here. It is that of 'Western Non-Interpolations.' This name was applied by them to certain clauses or verses which are rightly (in their opinion) absent from some or all Western documents, but present in all other MSS. In these cases they allowed the superiority of the Western text over their favourite Greek MS(S). B (and ℵ). In the instances about to be cited, these two MSS., or B alone, like the bulk of the others, exhibit interpolations which are no part of the original text. The tendency to make the text as full as possible is characteristic of documents in general, and decidedly so of the Western group. When, therefore, we find Western documents actually showing a shorter text than their rivals, there is every presumption that in these

cases the Western documents are right. 'The doubtful words are superfluous, and in some cases intrinsically suspicious, to say the least; while the motive for their insertion is usually obvious.'[1] With one exception, the wrongous interpolation from John xix. 34 in Matt. xxvii. 49, where Syrian documents back the Western in omission, the more important of these Western non-interpolations occur in the last three chapters of Luke.[2] The following are the passages:[3]

1. Matthew vi. 15 [τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν]
2. Matthew vi. 25 [ἢ τί πίητε]
3. Matthew ix. 34 [οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι . . . δαιμόνια.]
4. Matthew xiii. 33 [ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς]
5. Matthew xxi. 44 [καὶ ὁ πεσὼν . . . λικμήσει αὐτόν.]
6. Matthew xxiii. 26 [καὶ τῆς παροψίδος]
7. Matthew xxvii. 49 *fin.* [[†ἄλλος δὲ . . . αἷμα.]]
8. Mark ii. 22 [ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινούς]
9. Mark x. 2 [προσελθόντες Φαρισαῖοι]
10. Mark xiv. 39 [τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἰπών]
11. Luke v. 39 [Οὐδεὶς . . . χρηστός ἐστιν.]
12. Luke x. 41 f. [μεριμνᾷς . . . ἢ ἑνός·]
13. Luke xii. 19 [κείμενα . . . φάγε, πίε]
14. Luke xii. 21 [Οὕτως . . . εἰς θεὸν πλουτῶν.]
15. Luke xii. 39 [ἐγρηγόρησεν ἂν καὶ]
16. Luke xxii. 19*b*, 20 [[τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν . . . ἐκχυννόμενον.]]
17. Luke xxii. 62 [καὶ . . . ἔκλαυσεν πικρῶς.]
18. Luke xxiv. 3 [[τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ]]
19. Luke xxiv. 6 [[οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, ἀλλὰ ἠγέρθη.]]
20. Luke xxiv. 9 [ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου]
21. Luke xxiv. 12 [[Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος . . . τὸ γεγονός.]]
22. Luke xxiv. 36 [[καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν.]]
23. Luke xxiv. 40 [[καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν . . . πόδας.]]
24. Luke xxiv. 52 [[καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν]]
25. Luke xxiv. 53 [[προσκυνήσαντες αὐτὸν]]
26. John iii. 31, 32 [ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστίν *et* τοῦτο]
27. John iv. 9 [οὐ γὰρ . . . Σαμαρείταις.]

Double brackets are used where the editors are absolutely

[1] Westcott and Hort, p. 175.
[2] Cf. Westcott and Hort, § 240 (pp. 175 f.), and § 383 (pp. 294 f.).
[3] The best table of all the evidence is in Burkitt's *Evangelion da-Mepharreshê*, vol. ii. p. 229.

certain that the words form no part of the original text: single brackets where the case does not seem quite so clear. The evidence of the Old-Syriac has an important bearing on the character of these interpolations. The discovery of the Sinaitic Syriac manuscript shows that they are not all homogeneous.[1] The Old-Syriac agrees in omitting Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 15, 23, 25. In the cases of Nos. 16, 18, 24, 26, 27 its evidence is doubtful. At Nos. 1, 2, 11 the Sinaitic MS. is not extant. But Nos. 8, 10, 13, 14, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22 are extant in the Sinaitic MS. This fact proves the non-homogeneity of the interpolations. They are not all the result of one critical process, but at least two processes must have preceded their insertion into the original text. In Nos. 18 and 24 the Old-Syriac has an interpolated text, but the interpolation differs in wording from that in ℵ B; in the case of No. 16 harmonising influence, probably from the Diatessaron, has been at work. In Luke xii. 19 (No. 13) it is probable that the words omitted by the Western authorities D Lat. (vet.) are after all genuine; the omission is explained by Burkitt as due to the difficulty of understanding how a 'soul' could 'eat' or 'drink.' Probably also in Nos. 8, 10, 11 (?), and 14 the Old-Syriac is right in retaining the disputed passage. No. 21 is probably an interpolation in our MSS. of the Old-Syriac, and no part of the original version; similar cases are Nos. 17, 19, and 22. The Old-Syriac, then, was free from the interpolations characteristic of non-Western documents, and at the same time helps us to revise Westcott and Hort's list and to differentiate between the various items in it.

A small point in which later discoveries have enabled us to make an advance on the careful and laborious researches of Westcott and Hort is that of the ORTHOGRAPHY of the Greek text. Nothing could be more admirable of its kind than their sections 393-404 (pp. 301-10) and Appendix, pp. 143-73, on this subject. But these were dependent on data, not, perhaps, always reliable, and circumscribed in their range. Since their time, not only have Schmiedel

[1] Here I follow Burkitt (*Ev. da-Meph.* ii. 228 ff.) very closely.

(in his revision of Winer's *Grammatik*),[1] and Von Soden in various parts of his huge work,[2] devoted much attention to this subject, but the enormous discoveries of fresh dated papyri of the New Testament period have provided us with material for wider and surer inductions, which will not only bring us nearer to the original autograph of the New Testament, but will greatly simplify the grammar of it in many places. Professor J. H. Moulton in his *Grammar*,[3] as also Crönert,[4] Helbing,[5] Mayser,[6] Thackeray,[7] Radermacher,[8] and others, have collected much valuable material on this subject, some of which may be here borrowed in illustration of our point. The 'unusual aspirated forms' of Westcott and Hort (page 143), ἐφ' ἑλπίδι, etc., have been found in abundance in papyri and inscriptions. There can be little doubt that in the first century A.D. ἑλπίς was a great deal commoner than ἐλπίς. In this and other respects it will be wise to follow the great uncials where they give a form which strikes us as being out of the common. The coalescence of two -i sounds produced the forms ταμεῖον,[9] πεῖν, ὑγεία. The oldest papyrus documents containing parts of the New Testament almost invariably write the -ν ἐφελκυστικόν. We shall probably not be wrong in printing it everywhere in a new critical text of the New Testament. The papyri have enabled us to see that a distinction was drawn between γέννημα (from γεννάω, I beget), 'a young animal,' and γένημα (from γίνομαι, I come

[1] G. B. Winer's *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms*. Achte Auflage, neu bearbeitet von P. W. Schmiedel, i. Theil (Göttingen, 1894); ii. Theil (Göttingen, 1897, 1898), as yet unfinished.

[2] For example, pp. 1360 ff., 1688 ff.

[3] *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, by J. H. Moulton, vol. i. *Prolegomena*, 3rd ed. (Edinburgh, 1910). Also translated into German (1911).

[4] *Memoria Graeca Herculanensis* (Leipzig, 1903).

[5] *Grammatik der Septuaginta, Laut- und Wortlehre* (Göttingen, 1907), which, spite of Wackernagel's strictures, is of value.

[6] *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* (Leipzig, 1906).

[7] *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*, vol. i. (Cambridge, 1909).

[8] *Neutestamentliche Grammatik, das Griechisch des Neuen Testaments in Zusammenhang mit der Volkssprache*, dargestellt von L. Radermacher (Tübingen, 1911).

[9] We can see that this form had not come into being in the Ptolemaic age (cf. Mayser, *op. cit.*, p. 92).

into being), 'a vegetable product.' Westcott and Hort were wrong in calling ἀραβών (with one ρ) 'only Western.' In Egyptian papyri ἀραβών and ἀρραβών are about equally frequent. Examples such as these might be multiplied. They show that we shall be able to be much more precise in regard to orthography in our Greek texts of the New Testament in future. With regard to some words, we are so well informed from dated Egyptian documents that we can trace the rise and fall and sometimes the resurrection of certain forms. Orthography is no doubt a minor matter, but no fact is too slight to deserve attention when our concern is one of such moment as the original words of our New Testament.

But if it does not seem to us that the text of Westcott and Hort will be altered in many passages, there is a vast deal yet to be done, part of which we have already indicated. It is the duty of the Church not only to reconstruct the text of Scripture, but also to write its history. To take only one section at this point, the ancient commentators are an almost entirely neglected field, crying out for workers. By critical processes the texts which these commentators used can for the most part be reconstructed, as 'subnotation' is their regular practice; in other words, they take a clause or verse of Scripture, and then annotate below it. The discovery of a new uncial is always hailed with interest, but few seem to have the patience to attempt the restoration of such ancient texts as are lurking in the MSS. of Ambrosiaster's commentary on the Epistles of Paul. One of the tasks of the future must be the critical editing of all the New Testament commentaries preceding the invention of printing, if only for the sake of the texts lurking in them. It would be a great benefit if such texts, after critical reconstruction, were separately published *in extenso*. Some such proceeding is an indispensable preliminary to a complete knowledge of the history of the text.

Nor is the matter of the commentaries themselves to be neglected. This, also, must be critically edited, if only for the sake of the accompanying Scripture text. The com-

ment occasionally shows that the text of the passage of Scripture has been doctored by scribes. But the comments themselves are not without importance. It is true, of course, that every age must comment on Scripture for itself, but it is also true that many correct explanations are to be found in those commentaries, and the oldest known commentator to give a correct explanation should get the credit for it. Again, ancient commentators, like modern, borrowed much from their predecessors. All the commentaries should be edited with this in mind, the borrowings being clearly indicated. This task, however, belongs rather to the department of exegesis than to that of textual criticism. Yet, in conclusion, it must be obvious that these early commentators, being nearer in time to apostolic days, have some advantages denied to us in the interpretation of Scripture, particularly the Greek writers.

One of the most fascinating, as well as one of the most necessary, corollaries of this work is the correlation of texts found in Fathers with those found in extant MSS. It is in Latin that such signal work has been done in this department, and all within the last half-century. Every critical edition of a Father and every exact copy of a MS. makes this more nearly possible. Examples have already been given in an earlier chapter. It is only in this way that the history of the text can be even partially written, but individual workers must be content to cultivate a small field, and cultivate it well. The material will increase in quantity and also in quality, and broad but sure generalisations will become more and more possible.

The most suggestive part of Von Soden's large work is that where, at the conclusion of his introduction, he enumerates a number of tasks which the future ought to undertake. Some of them may be mentioned here: 'An investigation of the history of the European Latin pre-Hieronymian version, with the reconstruction of its original form as goal[1]; a collection, as critically sifted as possible,

[1] Rev. E. S. Buchanan has already prepared in MS. for the Gospel of Mark substantially what Von Soden desires.

of all patristic citations in the Greek and Latin languages prior to the date ± 325, but including Augustine's; at the same time the treatment of citations by translators of Greek patristic works into Latin is to be tested; a systematic investigation of all patristic citations in the fourth century, to fix whether and how far the recensions have persisted in their original words (vocabulary); monographs on single manuscripts or groups of manuscripts, including the previous history and the character of the therein reproduced text and the history of the manuscript; a restoration of the archetype of the bilingual edition of Paul on the basis of D E F G, a task complete in itself and not difficult nor tedious, which could be accomplished by a university seminar for textual criticism in two terms; a fixing of the possible interworkings between the Egyptian translations and Greek texts, specially the *H* text, as also of the direct relations between the Sahidic and Bohairic translations in their original forms and their possible stages of development; the translation of Ulfilas, source and causes of its divergences from *K* (after the manner of Odefoy, *Das gotische Lukas-Evangelium*, 1908); revision of the Wordsworth-White text of Jerome, the establishment of the principles followed by Jerome in his revision of the Old-Latin text, as also of the Greek text consulted by him in connexion with this; the Greek texts behind the later Oriental translations, so far as they are made directly from Greek (this has as yet been fixed more or less exactly only for the Armenian and the Ethiopic).'

THE CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

CHAPTER I

PRELIMINARY

The Idea and the Word

The idea of a canon, or exclusive selection of sacred books for use in public worship, is ultimately derived by the Church from Judaism, and some account of the formation of the Jewish Canon of the Old Testament[1] seems necessary as the model on which, consciously or unconsciously, the later New Testament Canon was formed. The canonical Old Testament is in three parts: Law, Prophets, and Writings. The tradition is that the Old Testament Canon was completely fixed at one time, but this is highly improbable. The canonisation of the Old Testament was a gradual process. The Law (that is, the Pentateuch) was the first part to be canonised. This began in the year 621, and was finally accomplished in 444. Compared with all the other books of the Jewish Canon the Law was proto-canonical, something altogether apart from and above the other canonical writings. If modern critical views are right, the Law was nevertheless subjected to rather free handling even after it became canonical. The Law was, in fact, canonical, but there was at first no canonical text of it. The 'prophets' are classified as the 'former prophets' and the 'latter prophets.' By the 'former prophets' is to be understood what we call the historical books. These can hardly have been canonical as early as 250. The collection of the 'latter prophets,' that is, the prophetic writings proper, may be placed about 200, but their

[1] I follow here Cornill, *Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament* (Eng. tr. by Box) (London, 1907), pp. 463 ff.

canonisation took place later. It was only in the second Christian century that the Old Testament Canon was finally closed, and this was an act of Talmudic Judaism for the purpose of self-preservation.

Alexandria followed different lines from Palestine. The Alexandrine Jews followed the principle of using whatever was suitable for edification, and thus admitted many Greek writings to which Palestine lent no countenance. The same kind of laxity survived in the Egyptian churches. The influence of the Greek was infinitely greater than that of the Hebrew, as we shall see below.

The Canon or the Bible of the early Church consisted of the Old Testament, with the Apocrypha, in the Septuagint Greek translation.[1] This translation, which had been gradually made between the third century B.C. and the first century B.C. (or A.D.) in Egypt, was the form in which the multitudinous Jews of the Dispersion, who had lost all knowledge of Hebrew, read their Old Testament. To them it had acquired the same sanctity as the original. To them it was, one may say, *the* original. It was this that was read always in their synagogues. On it their spiritual life had been nurtured for centuries. When Paul preached Christianity to the Jewish Diaspora, he read and commented on this translation in the Jewish synagogue, as the invariable preliminary to his mission. He preached always to the Jews first. The numerous Jewish proselytes also regarded the Septuagint Old Testament with the same reverence as those who were Jews by blood. As, finally, the first preachers of Christianity were themselves Jews, to whom the Old Testament was the Word of God, as it had been to Jesus Himself, we can see how natural it was that the Jewish-Gentile Church, as the new Israel, the only true sons of Abraham, should take over the LXX as its inalienable property. The Christians were taught to interpret it as referring to their own Jesus as Messiah, and to regard references in it to ὁ κύριος as allusions to the

[1] Some of the Apocryphal books are probably not translations but originals: the statement, however, may stand in this general form.

crucified and now glorified Messiah. The New Testament writers habitually use the LXX alone. So thoroughly was the transference of property effected, that early in the second century the non-Christian Jews felt that they could no longer regard the book as their own, and a fresh translation into Greek was made for their use by Aquila, of Sinope in Pontus. Henceforth the Septuagint was exclusively a Christian book.

But if the Old Testament had all the authority of a Divine word to all the Christians, there was one other source of Divine truth which was equally authoritative, namely, the sayings of Our Lord Himself. The words of the Messiah, the vicegerent of Jehovah—nay, in a sense, God Himself—could be of no less authority than those of the Law and Prophets. And it must have been so from the very first. The apostles in their evangelistic propaganda must have used almost exclusively the words of good news which they had heard from Jesus Himself. Nor does Paul himself appear at any disadvantage in this matter, as compared with the older apostles. Whencesoever derived, his knowledge of his Lord's teaching was complete and exact. It may be, as Moulton thinks,[1] that he had heard words from the lips of Jesus Himself. But whether or no, that he knew the teaching of Jesus thoroughly is beyond cavil. Even close students of the Gospels and Epistles would probably be surprised at the stupendous list of parallels between the two which Alfred Resch has provided in his *Der Paulinismus und die Logia Jesu*,[2] and Resch has no doubt given rather too much than too little, but the conviction deepens in the present writer that Paul had a written compendium of Jesus' teaching, of which traces appear in his writings. Besides the well-known 'It is happier to give than to receive,'[3] which itself proves that he had some source for sayings of Jesus now lost, there are clear traces in 1 Thess. v. 4 (cf. Matt. xxiv.

[1] *Expositor*, July 1911.
[2] Leipzig, 1904.
[3] Perhaps more exactly recorded in *Apost. Const.*, 'happy is the offerer than the receiver' (Resch, *Agrapha*[2] (Leipzig, 1906), p. 91).

43 and Luke xii. 39) and 1 Cor. xiii. 2 (cf. Matt. xvii. 20, xxi. 21; Mark xi. 23; Luke xvii. 6) of knowledge of the sayings of Jesus. Sayings of Jesus, then, orally or in writing, were in circulation throughout the earliest churches of all, and had the same authority as the Old Testament.

How long this state of affairs lasted we cannot say. The history of the Church between the time at which Paul's ministry ceased and the end of the first century is one that can be surmised more easily than it can be written, and if this is true of the general history, it is true also of the gradual introduction of certain works now in our New Testament into the services of the Church. The letters of Paul sent to special churches for special purposes were, no doubt, treasured in these churches, and read perhaps at frequent intervals to the congregations concerned; but at what time copies began to circulate beyond them, and to be read also before churches to which they were not addressed, and when, finally, a collection of them was made, it is impossible to say. Of the early history of the Gospels we know equally little. There must have been a time when each had an independent existence, long or short, but of this period we know nothing. It is not, in fact, till about the end of the second century that we get into more or less clear daylight.

In the course of our study of this subject, we must keep apart in our minds, as far as possible, two things which are apt to be confused. The first is the date at which the existence of a particular book is attested by clear evidence in a later writer that he knows its existence. This, of course, is not our primary concern. The second is the date and place at which it is first clearly apparent that a particular book is 'canonical,' that is, is read in the public official services of a church. Unfortunately it is not possible entirely to separate these two things. There is, in fact, a presumption that, if a Church writer quotes a book at all frequently, that book was authoritative in the Church to which he belonged, but a solitary reference to a sacred book in a learned writer like Clement or Origen

does not carry this conclusion with it. Fortunately, however, writers themselves occasionally speak in such a way as makes it certain whether the book in question was read in public services or not.

A brief recapitulation of the available evidence as to the early *existence* of particular documents now in our New Testament may not be useless at this point. The evidence of the Apostolic Fathers has been examined with care—for the Gospels by Professor Sanday,[1] for the New Testament as a whole by a group of Oxford scholars.[2] At the time at which Dr. Sanday's work was published, the Didache had not been discovered.[3] The following are the works showing the first marked trace of particular New Testament books, according to the investigations of a committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology.[4] The Synoptic tradition is first clearly evidenced by Barnabas and the Didache. The use of Matthew is first seen clearly in the Didache, of Mark in Hermas, of Luke in the Didache, and of John in Ignatius. The existence of the following books is first attested by First Clement: Acts, Romans (but see also under Barnabas), First Corinthians, Titus, Hebrews (but see Barnabas also), and the Apocalypse (?). The following books first appear in Barnabas: Romans (but see under First Clement), Ephesians (but see under Ignatius also), Colossians (?), Hebrews (but see under First Clement). The existence of the following is first attested by Ignatius: Galatians, Ephesians (but see also under Barnabas), Philippians, First and Second Timothy. Polycarp contains the first evidence of the existence of Second Corinthians, Second Thessalonians, First Peter and First John. Evidence of First Thessalonians (?) and James is first found in Hermas.[5] Evidence of the following books is entirely wanting in the Apostolic Fathers: Philemon, Second Peter, Second John, Third John, and Jude.

[1] *The Gospels in the Second Century* (London, 1876).
[2] *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford, 1905).
[3] Nor indeed had Tatian's Diatessaron.
[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 137.
[5] Some might, however, argue that it is 'James' who has used Hermas.

The word 'Canon' has had a history unsurpassed in interest, perhaps, by any other word in the Greek language. Cognate, perhaps, with κάνη (κάννα), a reed (and so a pipe), a word which is borrowed from some Semitic language, κανών is a reed, especially when used as a tool, and then a tool, whether made of wood or not. It is most often a tool of the carpenter or builder, used for determining the right direction of a piece of wood or stone which is to be used in building—*the level*, a simple piece of wood carefully made and usually provided with a scale, exactly translated by the Latin *regula*. Besides being straight, it had to be incapable of bending. It was used also for the scribe's ruler, *regula*. It is from this literal sense of level, ruler, that all the metaphorical senses are derived. Of these the most important are the following: (1) Written laws as the rule for discerning right and wrong, or as the rule of behaviour. Thus, though not frequently, the Gospel or the words of Jesus or the Holy Scriptures are spoken of as a κανών.[1] (2) The exemplary man, what we might call the ideal man, is compared to a ruler, and called κανών. (3) *The rules* of philosophers and grammarians *expressed in clauses*, especially ethical rules. In the Church, from the middle of the second century, we find the expressions ὁ κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας (*regula veritatis*), ὁ κανὼν τῆς πίστεως (*regula fidei*) very frequently, in the sense of *the formulated confession of the Christian faith*, especially the baptismal creed; and then in a wider sense, the contents of the teaching generally recognised in the Church (this last almost exclusively Greek, ὁ ἐκκλησιαστικὸς κανών or ὁ κανὼν τῆς ἐκκλησίας). The *rule of truth* (*faith*) is that norm according to which all one's teaching and life must be conformed, as it comes from divine sources. The idea of the *Church rule* is a gradual development, namely, that the Church herself has drawn up a body of rules and communicated them to her members for them to follow. (4)

[1] Clem., *Str.*, iv. 15 (after citing words of Jesus) κατὰ τὸν κανόνα τοῦ εὐαγγελίου πολιτευσάμενος, 'having lived his life according to the rules of the Gospel': Tert., *c. Marc.*, iii. 17, *oportet actum eius ad scripturarum* regulam (standard) *recognosci*, etc.

Thus comes the sense *ecclesiastical ordinance*, each simple ordinance of real or fictitious ecclesiastical authority, especially one passed by a synod. (5) The ordinance which fixes the regular amount (of corn, etc.) to be paid (annually) by a province or a property gives its name to the amount itself, and thus κανών comes to mean the *regular* (yearly) *natural supply*, and *tribute* generally, both in political and Church life. (6) A much commoner use, probably derived from the row of marks indicating scale or measurement on the rule or level, is that of *list* (=κατάλογος), *index*, *table* (=πίναξ). This is the sense which we find in the Eusebian *Canons* of the Gospels, ten *lists* of passages in the Gospels, consisting of numbers simply;[1] also in Priscillian's and other *canones*, lists of subject matter contained in the Pauline Epistles, with references attached, etc. (7) =κλῆρος, *lot*, a list of persons eligible for office or privilege, a sense derived from (6). (8) The *canon* of the mass, so derived probably from the list of persons specially commemorated in it, the saints, as well as the living and dead, for whom prayers are asked. To put a dead person in such a list is to *canonise* him.

The regular use of the word in connexion with the Bible is not found before the middle of the fourth century. The first instance is in Athanasius' *Decrees of the Synod of Nicaea*,[2] written soon after 350, in which the phrase occurs, in connexion with the Shepherd of Hermas, μὴ ὂν ἐκ τοῦ κανόνος, *not belonging to the canon*. In his Easter Letter of 367 he refers to the Scriptures as κανονιζόμενα, in opposition to the ἀπόκρυφα, and to distinguish them from the ἀναγινωσκόμενα. Other somewhat later contemporary instances of such expressions might be quoted, but their use is by no means universal, to the exclusion of earlier expressions which convey the same idea in different words. In fact, the idea of a Canon is much older than the word in that sense. Despite the fact, however, that the word was not universally employed, its use was sufficiently

[1] The rules for their use are contained in the letter of Eusebius to Carpian, prefixed to the *Canones*.

[2] No. 18.

wide to create various derivatives, such as κανονίζειν, 'to put into a (the) canon,' ἀποκανονίζειν, 'to put out of a (the) canon,' κανονικός (of a book), 'belonging to a (the) canon,' ἀκανόνιστος, 'not belonging to a (the) canon.' There can be no doubt that the word κανών used thus with reference to the Bible is directly derived from sense (6) above, that of *list*. A κανών is a *list* of biblical books which may be read in the public services of *a* church, and, if such be produced with the authority of a synod or council, of *the* Church. The use of the word had in the mind of its first creator no other sense than just this. It is merely by the accident that a list if promulgated by an ecclesiastical body tends thereby to acquire an ecclesiastical authority that that mixture in sense has been produced which the word κανών has since exhibited. A confusion with the other sense of *rule* (3, above), already familiar in Church life, was naturally produced. The Greek word early found entry among the Latins, occurring as it does in the Cheltenham Canon (for which see below) of date about 360, and later in Priscillian, Filaster, Rufinus, and Augustine.[1] There is the difference, however, that some of these Latins call the Bible itself *canon*. The occasional application, also, of *regularis* as a translation of κανονικός, was doomed to cause misunderstanding among the Latins as to the original force of the term *canon*, used in connexion with Scripture. This caused them to conceive of Scripture as the highest, and in matters of faith the final, authority. The *canon* was closed, complete, and authoritative in the way that the κανών never was, and, indeed, never has been. Thus enters in the Latin genius for law and order, and takes a separate course from the Greek freedom.

Previous to the middle of the fourth century the idea of an exclusive collection of documents of divine revelation is expressed by (παλαιὰ and καινὴ) διαθήκη. By διαθήκη is meant in ordinary Greek 'a last will and testament,' but the strange thing is that in the Septuagint and in the New

[1] The modern character of the word is illustrated by his *Epistle* lxxxii. 3, *solis eis scripturarum libris, qui iam* canonici *appellantur*.

Testament[1] the word is employed in the sense of συνθήκη 'a covenant' or 'compact' between God and man, especially when regarded on the Godward side.[2] The Old Testament, as the record containing the bargain between God and Abraham, and God and Moses, came to be known in Greek-speaking circles as διαθήκη. When the further revelation came, the final bargain between God and His creatures, sealed in the way of earlier covenants by the blood of a victim, Jesus, it became necessary to distinguish between the collection of early documents testifying to this, and those which testified to the earlier covenant, which was superseded but still held in remembrance and regard. This was done by the addition of the word 'old,' παλαιά, *vetus*, not ἀρχαία, *antiqua*, not 'antiquated': old, yet still valuable. So the other was called 'new,' καινή, *fresh*, not νέα, *youthful*, *young in age*, but fresh as regards man's knowledge of it. The words ἐνδιάθηκος and ἐνδιάθετος were used of documents within these διαθῆκαι. But all these words as applied to Scripture are relatively late, not appearing before the end of the second century, and only occasionally then. The attempt to render διαθήκη into Latin was attended with some fluctuation. Tertullian, who did so much to create a Latin Christian terminology, sometimes represents it by *instrumentum*, a legal term meaning a document drawn up in proper (legal) form, sometimes by *testamentum*, which, as it means 'will and testament,' is an exact translation of the everyday sense of διαθήκη, but an incorrect rendering of the biblical sense. It was, however, this latter rendering which was destined to survive: *instrumentum* had but a brief currency.[3]

By far the most widespread expressions both in early

[1] Cf., for instance, Exod. xxiv. 7, Deut. ix. 9, 2 Cor. iii. 14.

[2] Except in Heb. ix. 16, where most scholars admit the everyday sense. Riggenbach, *Der Begriff der* ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ *im Hebräerbrief*, in *Theologische Studien Theodor Zahn zum* 10. *Oktober* 1908 *dargebracht* (Leipzig, 1908), pp. 289-316 [also obtainable separately], has argued for this use throughout Hebrews. See also Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor* (London, 1908), ii. pp. 563 f.

[3] Sometimes we find in Latin *uetus* and *novum* used absolutely, without *testamentum* or any other word. *Instrumento* in Pseudo-Jerome *in Rom.* vii. 12 (Migne, *P. L.*, xxx.) is an interpolation.

and later times were more general. Even at the time when the New Testament was being written, ἡ γραφή (singular) was regularly employed in the sense 'passage of Scripture.' The whole collection of the Old Testament writings was known, in the plural, as αἱ γραφαί, *scripturae, the writings* (par excellence). Sometimes epithets were added, ἅγιαι (*sanctae*), ἱεραί (*sacrae*), θεῖαι (*diuinae*), κυριακαί (*dominicae*). The singular, in a collective sense, of the whole of Scripture, is much rarer than the plural, but is, on the whole, commoner in later times than it is in the earlier. The whole Old Testament is sometimes spoken of as 'the Old Law,' and the whole New Testament as 'the New Law.' And all the terms mentioned are used of the Scriptures in the Church as the exclusive documents of divine revelation, read in the public worship of the Church, as distinguished from other books, however edifying and truly Christian in their tendency. The Church as such only possesses those writings that are read in her public services. This idea comes out clearly in various passages of the Muratorian Canon. In Greek the public reading is expressed by the words δημοσιεύεσθαι (δημεύεσθαι) ἐν ἐκκλησίαις. The original sense of the word ἀπόκρυφος is in contrast to that of ἐνδίαθηκος, etc. A work is ἀπόκρυφος (ἀπόρρητος), not because any stigma is attached to it, but simply because it is read not in public service, but only in private, in secret. Ἀπόκρυφοι, ἀπόρρητοι, *apocryphi, secreti*, are, in fact, also the opposites of ῥητοί, *manifesti, vulgati, publici*. But we must not imagine any hard and fast system in the earliest generations obtaining throughout all churches. Down to and including the fourth century there were important differences in attitude towards certain books in various parts of the Church catholic. Sometimes even in churches of the same province or place a book was received in one church, while rejected in another. Even the idea of regular reading at public worship was not absolutely fixed everywhere. Communications in no sense scriptural were sometimes read aloud to a congregation instead of Scripture lessons, and not infrequently accounts

of martyrs and their sufferings were so substituted, especially on their feast days in the churches to which they had belonged. As the spiritual life of the congregations was a primary object of the services, a wise variety, which avoided all mere formality, was a real sign of spiritual health. Despite this variety, however, there was always present and continually growing in these early generations a more or less fixed idea as to the canonicity of certain books, by which canonicity is meant only their right to be read in the public worship of God : ἐκκλησιαζόμενος and ἐκκλησιαστικός remain, in fact, the equivalents of κανονικός. It is not till about 330 to 350 that lists of these books were drawn up in the effort to secure uniformity everywhere.

The basis of this reception in the Church was the Church's belief that these particular books, and these only, had been handed over to the Church. Thus Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iii. 93) speaks of the τὰ παραδεδομένα ἡμῖν τέτταρα εὐαγγέλια, 'the four Gospels that have been handed down to us,' in contrast to the 'Gospel according to the Egyptians.' So far as we know, even the early Church possessed no record who it was who handed these works over. Irenaeus in various well-known passages practically speaks of the writing of the Gospels as itself a handing over of them to various churches, as it was with the object of serving the Church that they were written.[1] Similarly, it was assumed as self-evident that the Epistles and the Apocalypse were really intended for a wider circle than those actually addressed in them at the first. As to the Old Testament there could, of course, be no ambiguity. The Apostles and the early 'Fathers' had handed over just these writings and no others to the Church. Such was the regular belief in the third and fourth centuries, and also later.

[1] *Adv. Haer.*, i. 27, 2; iii. 1, 1. 11, 9; iv. 34, 1.

CHAPTER II

EARLIEST COLLECTIONS OF NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS

THE exact dates of the composition of our GOSPELS are unknown. A large number of investigators would agree that Mark's Gospel is earlier than either Matthew's or Luke's, as it is now commonly considered to have been a principal source of both. There would also be general agreement that the Fourth Gospel is later than any of the Synoptics. Its internal character suggests this; but if it be true, as Abbott argues, that John deliberately inserts Marcan matter which had been passed over in silence by Matthew and Luke, it can only be because he was acquainted with all three, and desired to correct what he considered defects of the later pair by the Petrine Mark.[1] Some such scheme as the following would meet with wide approval among cautious and learned critics: Mark between 60 and 70, Matthew and Luke between 70 and 80, and John about 90 to 100 A.D. But Harnack has recently argued for a considerably earlier date for the Synoptics.[2] He would put Mark at latest between 50 and 60, Matthew immediately after 70, and Luke in Paul's lifetime. We shall not be far wrong in assuming that the fourfold Gospel, as we know it, can hardly have existed before the year 100.

The earliest mention of a written Gospel is in the Didache (? 110). The Lord's Prayer is there (viii. 2) introduced by the words ὡς ἐκέλευσεν ὁ κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ αὐτοῦ, οὕτω προσεύχεσθε, and in three other passages 'the

[1] Abbott, *Johannine Grammar*, p. 71 (John).

[2] *Neue Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte und zur Abfassungszeit der synoptischen Evangelien* (Leipzig, 1911), Eng. tr. *The Date of Acts*, etc. (London, 1911).

Gospel' (singular) is referred to, and clearly means 'the (written) Gospel.' So exactly also in Ignatius, who was contemporary with the date we have approved for the Didache.[1] From such references it is perfectly clear that already at this time 'the Gospel' was something well known in the churches, a document or body of documents, to which it was sufficient to appeal without further specification. It is very exceptional to find any name of an author used, in referring to a written Gospel. This very fact suggests that it was a set of documents, to which the collective term 'Gospel' was already applied, as we know it regularly was at a later time. Who first united the four into one group or set it is quite impossible to say, but it is not improbable that the union took place either in the province of Asia or in Italy, in the first instance. The Gospel of Matthew seems from the first to have obtained a pre-eminence never accorded to the others. Citations of Gospel matter are generally nearer in language to it than to the others: Papias tells us that at Ephesus, in the lifetime of his teacher John, a Gospel of Mark was used.[2] Cerinthus, John's contemporary, preferred it to any other.[3] The reference of Papias to Matthew's Gospel is well known.[4] The spurious ending of Mark, chapter xvi., verses 9 to 20, which may have been written by Aristion, in Papias's period and milieu, is obviously in the main a cento from the Gospels of Luke (chap. xxiv.) and John (chap. xx.), and thus attests their existence and value at the period at which it was written. The non-canonical Gospels, such as the Gospel of Peter, derive all their valuable matter from our canonical Gospels. Marcion's Gospel was a deliberate preference of Luke's Gospel to the others as more nearly representing his own point of view. Tatian employed our canonical Gospels, and no other Gospels, as the basis of his Diatessaron. Their position must, therefore, have

[1] Cf. Philad. viii. 2: *ἤκουσά τινων λεγόντων ὅτι, 'ἐὰν μὴ ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις* (the archives) *εὕρω, ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, οὐ πιστεύω.'*

[2] Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii.², 207-11, etc.; *Forschungen*, vi. 105, etc.

[3] Iren. iii. 11, 7 (cf. i. 26, 1).

[4] Cf. Professor Peake's volume in this series, pp. 119 f., 122.

been long assured in Rome before the date of that compilation, 170.

During the period 95 to 140 Zahn can find only four Gospel citations which cannot be derived from our four Gospels, side by side with many which attest the Church use of our four. The four citations are as follows: (*a*) Clem. ii. chap. 5, §§ 2-4: λέγει γὰρ ὁ κύριος· 'ἔσεσθε ὡς ἀρνία ἐν μέσῳ λύκων.' ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος αὐτῷ λέγει· 'ἐὰν οὖν διασπαράξωσιν οἱ λύκοι τὰ ἀρνία.' εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ Πέτρῳ· 'μὴ φοβείσθωσαν τὰ ἀρνία τοὺς λύκους μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν αὐτά· καὶ ὑμεῖς μὴ φοβεῖσθε τοὺς ἀποκτέννοντας ὑμᾶς καὶ μηδὲν ὑμῖν δυναμένους ποιεῖν, ἀλλὰ φοβεῖσθε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν ὑμᾶς ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος τοῦ βαλεῖν εἰς γέενναν πυρός.' This, which may be from the Gospel of Peter, seems a make-up from Luke x. 3, Matt. x. 16, Luke xii. 4, Matt. x. 28.[1] (*b*) *Ibid.* 8, § 5: λέγει γὰρ ὁ κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ· 'εἰ τὸ μικρὸν οὐκ ἐτηρήσατε, τὸ μέγα τίς ὑμῖν δώσει; λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὁ πιστὸς ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῷ πιστός ἐστιν.' This is *like* Luke xvi. 10-12.[2] (*c*) *Ibid.* 12, §§ 2-6: ἐπερωτηθεὶς γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος ὑπό τινος, πότε ἥξει αὐτοῦ ἡ βασιλεία, εἶπεν· 'ὅταν ἔσται τὰ δύο ἕν, καὶ τὸ ἔξω ὡς τὸ ἔσω, καὶ τὸ ἄρσεν μετὰ τῆς θηλείας, οὔτε ἄρσεν οὔτε θῆλυ. 'τὰ δύο' δὲ 'ἕν' ἐστιν, ὅταν λαλῶμεν ἑαυτοῖς ἀλήθειαν καὶ ἐν δυσὶν σώμασιν ἀνυποκρίτως εἴη μία ψυχή. καὶ 'τὸ ἔξω ὡς τὸ ἔσω' τοῦτο λέγει. τὴν ψυχὴν λέγει 'τό ἔσω,' 'τὸ' δὲ 'ἔξω' τὸ σῶμα λέγει. ὃν τρόπον οὖν σου τὸ σῶμα φαίνεται, οὕτως καὶ ἡ ψυχή σου δῆλος ἔστω ἐν τοῖς καλοῖς ἔργοις. καὶ 'τὸ ἄρσεν μετὰ τῆς θηλείας, οὔτε ἄρσεν οὔτε θῆλυ,' τοῦτο λέγει· ἵνα ἀδελφὸς ἰδὼν ἀδελφὴν οὐδὲν φρονῇ περὶ αὐτῆς θηλυκὸν μηδὲ φρονῇ τι περὶ αὐτοῦ ἀρσενικόν. 'ταῦτα ὑμῶν ποιούντων,' φησίν, 'ἐλεύσεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ πατρός μου.' The parts outside the inverted commas, namely, the explanatory part, may be due either to the evangelist who is being quoted, or to the author of 'Second Clement.' (*d*) Ignatius, *Zmyrn.*, iii. 2: ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πετρὸν ἦλθεν, ἔφη αὐτοῖς· 'λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με,

[1] Cf. Hemmer's note in his edition (Paris, 1909).

[2] Zahn points out (*Grundriss*, p. 39, n. 14) that this is produced by the fusion of Luke xvi. 10 and an apocryphal saying found in Iren. ii. 34, 3, and Hippolytus, *Refut. Haer.*, x. 33.

καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον.' Compare Luke xxiv. 39. What follows in Ignatius may be also in whole or in part derived from the same source. The last part above was also in the Κήρυγμα Πέτρου, and also perhaps in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*.[1] Such are all the instances of matter extraneous to our four Gospels in that earliest period, and they are in favour of the almost unquestioned supremacy of our four Gospels. It must be remembered that there was an immense amount of evangelic matter floating about at this date. This fact makes it all the more worthy of remark that so little of it should have passed into the writings of responsible authors.

The manner of the growth of a collection of Pauline Epistles in the Church can be to some extent imagined. How many letters Paul really wrote we do not know, but, excluding the Pastorals as probably not genuine, at least as they stand, and certainly wanting in the oldest canon of which we have any exact knowledge, namely Marcion's, we know that he wrote at least four to Corinth, in the province of Achaia, of which the second and fourth have survived; three to the province of Asia, namely, 'Ephesians,' Colossians, and Philemon; three to the province of Macedonia, First Thessalonians, Second Thessalonians, and Philippians; one to the province of Galatia, and one to Rome. The Corinthians probably suppressed the first and third letters of Paul, as doing them even less honour than those that have survived. The group of three, 'Ephesians,' Colossians, and Philemon, all written about the same time, were certainly all read in Colossae, and one can well understand how the group would be found at Ephesus. Similarly the Macedonian group would be known at Thessalonica, and the Epistle to the Galatians at some important city in the province. The Epistle to the Romans may have been circulated in the East by Paul himself as an anonymous epistle, as some scholars think. In any case, the best way to circulate anything would be to send it to Rome. It will thus be readily seen that any

[1] Orig. *de Principiis*, praef. 8; Jerome, *On Isaiah*, lib. 18, prol.

person desiring to collect epistles of Paul would only have to go to a few leading churches in leading cities to obtain all those that have actually survived. The relations between the churches were in the first century so close and so constant, that very little time would be required to gather together all we have got.

In Ignatius and Polycarp we get the first clear traces of knowledge of Paul derived from his letters.[1] The way in which they refer to Paul shows that they can assume knowledge of his letters on the part of communities which they address in Asia, Macedonia, Rome. Of definite mention of a collection of letters we find the first instance in Ignatius. He says, with considerable exaggeration,[2] that Paul remembers (mentions) the Ephesians, ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ 'in every letter.' This implies, of course, knowledge of a considerable number. As a matter of fact, the epistles to the Galatians, the Philippians, and the Thessalonians make no express mention of the church of Ephesus (or the churches of Asia). In his epistle to the Philippians, Polycarp recalls the fact that Paul when absent had written to them ἐπιστολάς. This is probably a rhetorical plural, and does not necessarily imply on Polycarp's part any knowledge of another letter beyond the one we know. It is not impossible, however, that he included those to the Thessalonians, as if they belonged to the Philippians also, for he refers 2 Thess. i. 4 to them directly.[3] Clear traces that Philippians, First Thessalonians, Second Thessalonians once formed a group by themselves are to be found especially in arrangements of the Epistles in Latin subsisting much later. D (Paul), Clement of Alexandria,[4] Tertullian (*ca.* 197), Victorinus of Pettau († 303),[5] Ambrosiaster (*ca.* 375),[6] Pelagius (409), Augustine († 430), Cassiodorus (*ca.* 550), etc., and at least fifty Vulgate manuscripts

[1] Clement (95 A.D.) of course refers distinctly to 1 *Cor.* in his *Ep.* xlviii. 1-3.

[2] Ign., *Eph.*, xii. 2. [3] Polyc., *Eph.*, xi. 3. [4] *Protrept*, 87.

[5] In his commentary on the Apocalypse. I have been privileged to see the sheets of Haussleiter's forthcoming Vienna edition.

[6] *Study of Ambrosiaster*, p. 197.

known to Berger,[1] place 1 Thess. and 2 Thess. before Col., and not after.[2] The reference in Second Peter, whatever be the date of that pseudepigraph, clearly shows that in the time of the writer the Epistles of Paul had been collected, and, what is more, were regarded as Scripture (iii. 16, ἐν πάσαις ἐπιστολαῖς . . . στρεβλοῦσιν ὡς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς . . . 'as also the rest of the Scriptures,' clearly implies that to the writer Paul's Epistles were collected and Scripture). As to the arrangement of this early collection as a whole but little is known. It was certainly without Hebrews, and possibly First Corinthians began it, and Romans ended it. At least, in the second century, both the Muratorian Canon and Tertullian have such an arrangement.[3] First Corinthians may have been put first as the longest, and Romans last as anonymous in that collection, or it may have arisen either in Rome or in Corinth : we cannot tell, we can only speculate.

About 140, however, a canon was constructed at Rome, of which we possess exact details. The heretic Marcion found a number of Pauline Epistles already in existence, but considered it necessary for the purpose of his communities that they should be expurgated and properly arranged. It is probable that, in addition to the work of arrangement and expurgation,[4] he equipped them with brief prologues and with sections and section headings. At least, a set of prologues in Latin, which are undoubtedly of Marcionite origin, is found in conjunction with sections and section headings, which seem to be constructed for such a collection.[5] From Tertullian and Epiphanius we learn the order of the Epistles in this canon. It was Galatians, First Corinthians, Second Corinthians, Romans, First Thessalonians, Second Thessalonians, Laodiceans (=Ephe-

[1] *Histoire de la Vulgate* (Paris, 1893), p. 341.

[2] Origen had possibly 1 Thess., 2 Thess., Phil. (Zahn, *Grundriss*, p. 36). See my notes also to Documents L and Q.

[3] Zahn, *Gesch. des Kanons*, ii. pp. 69 f., 344-54.

[4] See, for example, my notes on Rom. i. 18, viii. 11, ix. (init.), xii. 18; Gal. ii. 14, iii. 6-8, iv. 4, vi. 17.

[5] Printed as Document A at the end of this book after De Bruyne and Corssen.

sians), Colossians, Philippians, Philemon. The arrangement was determined by Marcion's theology, as Galatians is the most anti-Jewish of all the Epistles. Our Epistle to the Ephesians he found without title; and determining, probably rightly, that it was the Epistle referred to in Col. iv. 16 as that which is to come from Laodicea to Colossae, gave it the title 'To the Laodiceans.'[1] It is difficult to determine Marcion's attitude to the Pastoral Epistles, which it is generally believed he must have known, but he certainly excluded them from his list. His whole collection he named the ἀποστολικόν.

The fortunes of the Catholic or Canonical or Apostolic Epistles before fixity was reached are exceedingly interesting, but of their earliest history and use we know even less than we know of the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles. It is not, however, straining probabilities to argue that the First Epistle of John and the First Epistle of Peter were publicly read in this early period, at least in the province of Asia. With regard to the Book of Acts, its close connexion with the Third Gospel makes it very probable that it was read from an early time. The fact that the letters in the Apocalypse were addressed to definite churches assures its position in the province of Asia, and its secure position in the West suggests that it was very early read in Italy. Its doubtful position at a later period in the East generally, suggests that it never had any great vogue outside Asia. About the close of this early period the Shepherd of Hermas would appear to have been publicly read in certain churches, being accorded an important place very soon after the date of its composition.

It will not be amiss at this point to collect the scattered data as to the public use of individual books, some of which were afterwards included in the New Testament, in this early period. The Valentinian school of heretics was content to use the four Gospels of the Church, which they

[1] See Souter in *Expositor* (Aug. and Oct. 1911); Moffatt in *Expositor* (Sept. 1911), both preceded by Harnack, *Sitzungsberichte d. k. preuss. Akad. der Wiss.* for 1910, pp. 693-709, and others.

interpreted in their own way, with the addition of a 'Gospel of Truth' which served to illustrate the teaching of the regular Gospels. There is evidence, too, that the following Epistles of Paul were known to them: Romans, First and Second Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, which practically means that they knew First and Second Thessalonians and Philemon as well. In addition to these well-known writings, afterwards accepted everywhere, the Valentinians also used the *Gospel of Peter*. A former Valentinian Cassian was the founder of the Docetic sect, in which this Gospel was used. It is probable, therefore, that the Gospel was written by an oriental Valentinian at Syrian Antioch about the middle of the second century. The *Acts of John* and the *Acts of Peter*, too, belonged to this sect, Leucius their author being a member of the Asiatic branch of the Valentinians. These apostles are represented as drawing on their own recollections of Jesus, and the author thus gets a free hand to introduce what he will. Zahn has found traces of the use of the Apocalypse, Acts, First and Second Peter, and Hebrews in Valentinian works of this period,[1] from which it would appear that their New Testament was like that of other Christians.

The vague references to sacred writings of the New Dispensation in Justin Martyr have occupied the closest attention of scholars of the highest calibre during the last generation or so. He refers in a well-known passage [2] to the ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων as read in public service, and from another place one learns that the name popularly given to these recollections or memoirs was Εὐαγγέλια.[3] It is notorious that Justin's method of citation is unsatisfactory from the point of view of the modern critic, and the question what Gospels were known to him has been hotly debated. There is now practical certainty that he used Matthew, Luke, and John, and the reference to the recol-

[1] *Forschungen*, vi. pp. 197 ff.; *Gesch. des neut. Kanons*, i. pp. 754-78, 787; ii. pp. 853-55.
[2] *Apol.* i. 67. [3] *Apol.* i. 66.

lections of the Apostle Peter is best explained as a reference to St. Mark's Gospel. There is also much evangelic material in the works of Justin, which finds no place in our Gospels, but we have no warrant for the supposition that any but our four Gospels were used in the public services of the Church in general in his time. Indeed, the Gospel text was subjected to such free handling in the earliest period that it would not be at all amiss to argue that the extra material found in such early writers as Justin and Clement of Alexandria was all to be found in some copy or other of the fourfold Gospel. Justin knows the Apocalypse as a prophetic work by the Apostle John.[1] Knowledge of the following further books is evident from his writings: Acts, First Peter, Romans, First Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, Second Thessalonians, Hebrews, and the Didache.

[1] *Dial. c. Tryph.*, 81, 3: *καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν ἀνήρ τις, ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰωάννης, εἷς τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ χριστοῦ, ἐν ἀποκαλύψει γενομένῃ αὐτῷ χίλια ἔτη ποιήσειν ἐν Ἰερουσαλὴμ τοὺς τῷ ἡμετέρῳ χριστῷ πιστεύσαντας προεφήτευσεν.*

CHAPTER III

THE EARLIEST PERIOD FOR EXTENSIVE QUOTATION (170-220): THE EARLIEST VERSIONS

THERE is a feeling of intense gratification for the investigator on leaving the dim uncertainty of the earliest period with its fragmentary and poorly preserved literature, and emerging into the clearer light of the period of Tatian, Irenaeus, Clement, and Tertullian. At the beginning of the period the Diatessaron of Tatian was compiled. It is true that we have not the exact text of the Diatessaron, but we are tolerably well informed as to its precise contents. It was an effort, laudable enough in its way, though quite alien to the spirit of twentieth-century investigation, to combine into one whole out of our four Gospels one narrative, which should at once avoid overlapping, and yet should preserve everything valuable in these Gospels. It was probably because of the inconvenience of having to consult four rolls of the Gospels that one large roll of this description was made. Tatian's mosaic was most skilfully made, and was appropriately begun by the philosophic passage which opens the fourth Gospel. After this beginning he uses now one, now another Gospel, and builds up a more or less harmonious narrative.

That such a work was compiled in Rome about 170 is a striking testimony to the position of the four Gospels among Christians of the time. Not only does it prove the canonicity of our four: it at the same time proves, by its non-use of others, that our four, and only our four, were used in public services in the Church at large. It is true that Tatian was an Encratite, but in this matter of editing

there is no reason to suppose that his attitude would be distasteful to the majority of Christian believers. How widely the compilation was employed we cannot now say. There is something to be said for Von Soden's view that its use was practically universal, but it was in the Assyrian Church alone, to which Tatian belonged, that it became in a sense the official Gospel of the Church, and reigned as such for over two centuries, till episcopal authority displaced it by what we know as the Peshitta.

It is in Irenaeus, a native of Asia Minor, but Bishop of Lyons (*circa* 180-90), that we first find something like a whole New Testament freely quoted. The following books are quoted, some of them, particularly Acts and the Apocalypse, in long extracts: the Four Gospels, Acts, the Epistles of Paul (with the exception of Philemon), First Peter, First and Second John, and the Apocalypse. If we add to these the Epistle of Philemon and Third John, we shall probably not be far from the complete New Testament as recognised by Irenaeus. His attitude to the Gospels is so characteristic that, though it has often been quoted, it must be repeated here[1]:—

'Επειδὴ γὰρ τέσσαρα κλίματα τοῦ κόσμου ἐν ᾧ ἐσμεν, καὶ τέσσαρα καθολικὰ πνεύματα, κατέσπαρται δὲ ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς, στύλος τε καὶ στήριγμα[2] ἐκκλησίας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ πνεῦμα ζωῆς· εἰκὸς τέσσαρας ἔχειν αὐτὴν στύλους, πανταχόθεν πνέοντας τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν, καὶ ἀναζωπυροῦντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. ἐξ ὧν φανερὸν ὅτι ὁ τῶν ἁπάντων τεχνίτης Λόγος, ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῶν χερουβὶμ καὶ συνέχων τὰ πάντα, φανερωθεὶς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τετράμορφον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἑνὶ δὲ πνεύματι συνεχόμενον. καθὼς ὁ Δαβὶδ, αἰτούμενος αὐτοῦ τὴν παρουσίαν, φησίν· ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῶν χερουβὶμ ἐμφάνηθι.[3] καὶ γὰρ τὰ χερουβὶμ τετραπρόσωπα καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν εἰκόνες τῆς πραγματείας τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ. . . . καὶ τὰ εὐαγγέλια οὖν τούτοις σύμφωνα, ἐν οἷς ἐγκαθέζεται Χριστός· τὸ μὲν γὰρ κατὰ 'Ιωάννην τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡγεμονικὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ

[1] I borrow the translation from Sanday's *Gospels in the Second Century*, pp. 315 f. The Greek is in part improved from Harvey's text by Hort, whose copy of Harvey is in my possession.

[2] Cf. 1 Tim. iii. 15.

[3] Ps. lxxix. 2.

ἔνδοξον γενεὰν διηγεῖται λέγων· ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος, καὶ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν.[1] τὸ δὲ κατὰ Λουκᾶν, ἅτε ἱερατικοῦ χαρακτῆρος ὑπάρχον, ἀπὸ τοῦ Ζαχαρίου τοῦ ἱερέως θυμιῶντος τῷ θεῷ ἤρξατο.[2] . . . Ματθαῖος δὲ τὴν κατὰ ἄνθρωπον αὐτοῦ γέννησιν κηρύττει, λέγων· βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, υἱοῦ Δαυείδ, υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ.[3] . . . Μᾶρκος δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ προφητικοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἐξ ὕψους ἐπιόντος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐποιήσατο λέγων· ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ὡς γέγραπται ἐν Ἡσαίᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ, κ.τ.λ.

'For as there are four quarters of the world in which we live, as there are also four universal winds, and as the Church is scattered over all the earth, and the Gospel is the pillar and base of the Church and the breath of life, it is likely that it should have four pillars breathing immortality on every side and kindling afresh the life of men. Whence it is evident that the Word, the architect of all things, who sitteth upon the cherubim and holdeth all things together, having been made manifest unto men, gave to us the Gospel in a fourfold shape, but held together by one Spirit. As David, entreating for His presence, saith: Thou that sittest upon the cherubim, show thyself. For the cherubim are of fourfold visage, and their visages are symbols of the economy of the Son of God. . . . And the Gospels therefore agree with them over which presideth Jesus Christ. That which is according to John declares His generation from the Father sovereign and glorious,[4] saying thus: In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. And all things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made. . . . But the Gospel according to Luke, as having a sacerdotal character, begins with Zacharias the priest offering incense unto God. . . . But Matthew records his human generation, saying, The Book of the Generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham. . . . Mark took his beginning from the pro-

[1] Ioh. i. 1-3. [2] Cf. Lc. i. 8. [3] Matt. i. 1.

[4] For the benefit of the English reader I ought perhaps to point out that the words 'sovereign and glorious' belong to 'generation,' and not to 'Father.'

phetic Spirit coming down as it were from on high among men. The beginning, he says, of the Gospel according as it is written in Esaias the prophet,' etc.[1]

Postea quam surrexit dominus noster a mortuis et induti sunt superuenientis spiritus sancti uirtutem ex alto,[2] de omnibus adimpleti sunt et habuerunt perfectam agnitionem : exierunt in fines terrae, ea quae a deo nobis bona sunt euangelizantes et caelestem pacem hominibus adnuntiantes, qui [*read* hi ?] quidem et omnes pariter et singuli eorum habentes euangelium dei.[3] ὁ μὲν δὴ Ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν καὶ γραφὴν ἐξήνεγκεν εὐαγγελίου, τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελιζομένων καὶ θεμελιούντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον Μᾶρκος ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παραδέδωκεν. καὶ Λουκᾶς δὲ ὁ ἀκόλουθος Παύλου τὸ ὑπ' ἐκείνου κηρυσσόμενον εὐαγγέλιον ἐν βιβλίῳ κατέθετο. ἔπειτα Ἰωάννης ὁ μαθητὴς τοῦ κυρίου, ὁ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος αὐτοῦ ἀναπεσὼν[4] καὶ αὐτὸς ἐξέδωκεν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τῆς Ἀσίας διατρίβων.

'For after that our Lord rose from the dead and they were endowed with the power of the Holy Ghost coming upon them from on high, they were fully informed concerning all things, and had a perfect knowledge : they went out to the ends of the earth, preaching the Gospel of those good things that God hath given to us and proclaiming heavenly peace to men, having indeed both all in equal measure and each one singly the Gospel of God. So then Matthew among the Jews put forth a written Gospel in their own tongue[5] while Peter and Paul were preaching the Gospel in Rome and founding the Church. After their decease (or 'departure'), Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, himself too has handed down to us in writing the

[1] Iren., *Adv. Haer.*, iii. 11, 8.
[2] Cf. Acts i. 8.
[3] Up to this point the Greek of Irenaeus is not extant, and we have to depend on the fourth-century Latin version.
[4] Cf. Ioh. xiii. 25, xxi. 20.
[5] This, of course, comes from Papias : cf. Peake's *Critical Introduction to the New Testament* (in this series), pp. 122, 119 f.

subjects of Peter's preaching.[1] And Luke, the companion of Paul, put down in a book the Gospel preached by him. Afterwards, John, the disciple of the Lord, who also leaned upon His breast, likewise published his Gospel while he dwelt at Ephesus in Asia.' [2]

These passages are interesting in various ways. They illustrate, of course, the very uncritical scholarship of the early days; but for our present purpose their chief interest is that they show our four Gospels, and these only, in a position of unquestioned authority, which had apparently persisted for a long period. It is also not without significance that the Gospels appear in our present (the Eastern) order, and not in the Western order (Matthew, John, Luke, Mark), in spite of the fact that Irenaeus himself used what we call a Western text. The doctrine of the 'inspiration' of the Gospels is also here adumbrated, and it is not at all identical with 'verbal inspiration,' as understood in modern times.

The later contemporary of Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, the greatest pundit of the Eastern Church, though inferior in biblical knowledge to his successor Origen, distinguishes clearly between canonical and uncanonical Gospels. For instance, in quoting a saying from an uncanonical Gospel, he says: 'We do not find this saying in the four Gospels that have been handed down to us, but in that according to the Egyptians.' [3]

Tertullian (*flor.* 197-220), presbyter of Carthage, but at one time resident in Rome, who wrote both in Greek and Latin, but mainly in the latter language, a man of real learning and the founder of Latin Christian theological terminology, goes farther even than Clement. For, while Clement is given to quoting widely from all ancient Greek literature, sacred and profane, and makes considerable use of 'Gospels' not now in our Bible, Tertullian confines himself rigidly to our four Gospels, which he quotes largely,

[1] This, of course, comes from Papias: cf. Peake's *Critical Introduction to the New Testament* (in this series), pp. 122, 119 f.
[2] Iren. iii. 1, 1.
[3] *Stromateis*, iii. 13; cf. Sanday, *Gospels in Second Century*, p. 317.

and in all things his attitude is practically identical with that of the older-fashioned Christian student of to-day. He bases the authority of these four Gospels on the fact that they came from actual Apostles of the Master, or from those in close contact with such. His order, also, is significant, being the ordinary Western one, with the two Apostles first.

Finally, Origen of Alexandria and Caesarea (*obiit circa* 255), the greatest biblical scholar who ever lived, is of the same attitude. He speaks of the 'four Gospels, which alone are undisputed in the Church of God under heaven' (*τῶν τεσσάρων εὐαγγελίων, ἃ καὶ μόνα ἀναντίρρητά ἐστιν ἐν τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ*[1]). He then gives them in the order which is ours and that of Irenaeus, etc.

With regard to New Testament books other than the Gospels, we have seen above how far Irenaeus quotes these. Tertullian is just as comprehensive. He has nothing from the short epistle to Philemon, but all the other Pauline epistles are well represented. He is acquainted also with the Epistle to the Hebrews, but as the work of Barnabas. The use of Acts, First Peter, First John, and the Apocalypse is also abundant. Nor is there any less certainty that to him Jude was known and canonical.[2] Origen's canon has been preserved to us in his own words by Eusebius.[3] He recognises epistles of Paul addressed by him to the churches he founded, also First Peter as the incontested work of that apostle (*μίαν ἐπιστολὴν ὁμολογουμένην*), and the possibility of the genuineness of Second Peter also: 'for it is disputed' (*ἔστω δὲ καὶ δευτέραν· ἀμφιβάλλεται γάρ*). In addition to the Gospel by John, 'who leaned on the breast of Jesus,' he recognises the Apocalypse as by the same author. The genuineness of First John is also affirmed, and the possibility of the genuineness of the

[1] Origen, *Comm. on Matt.*, Book I., quoted by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, vi. 25, 4.

[2] The classic work on Tertullian's use of the New Testament is Hermann Rönsch's *Das Neue Testament Tertullians* (Leipzig, 1871). A new edition will be required when the Vienna edition of Tertullian is complete, and the collations of MSS. used for it have been revised.

[3] *Hist. Eccl.*, vi. 25, 7 ff.

Second and Third : 'for not all accept their genuineness' (ἐπεὶ οὐ πάντες φασὶν γνησίους εἶναι ταύτας). His words with regard to the Epistle to the Hebrews have often been quoted by later writers. 'It has not the usual style of the apostle whose name it bears,' he says ; 'for Paul was rough in his style, but the Greek of the Epistle to the Hebrews is very good. The thoughts of the Epistle are not inferior to those of the accepted apostolic writings. His verdict is that the thoughts are those of the Apostle, but the phraseology that of a pupil writing down his master's sayings. Who this pupil was, God alone knows. Clement, Bishop of Rome, and Luke have been suggested by previous writers.' The absence of the Acts of the Apostles from this enumeration is merely due to the fact that Eusebius is making extracts from Origen, and not giving us all his words. No authority is known to have accepted Luke's Gospel without also accepting its second volume, the *Acts*, except Marcion and his kindred.

We have thus got authoritative opinions from the four regions of Italy, Gaul, Africa, and Egypt as to New Testament books accepted in these countries. From this information we may conclude with certainty that throughout the Catholic Church about the end of the second century the following books were everywhere accepted as canonical, and on a level with the Old Testament :—

Gospel according to Matthew.
" " " Mark.
" " " Luke.
" " " John.
Acts of the Apostles.
Ten (Eleven) Epistles of St. Paul, addressed to churches.[1]
Apocalypse.
First John.
First Peter.

The position of other books was, as we have seen, less secure, but there can be little doubt that Second and Third

[1] Philemon is, of course, included here.

John were generally attached to First John, if only because they were too short to circulate by themselves; also that the Epistle to Philemon, as a kind of companion to the Epistle to the Colossians, was accepted. The Pastoral Epistles, too, were specifically excluded only by the Marcionites. The Epistle of Jude seems to have been accepted everywhere: so we conclude both from direct references, and also because no doubts about it have survived. There remain, therefore, only James and Second Peter, about which no sort of unanimity had been reached.

Testimony as to the usage of the period about 200 comes to us also from another quarter, namely, that of the early translations. The early history of these has been sketched, as far as it can be, in the first part of our volume. With regard to the Latin considerable uncertainty rules, but it would be generally admitted by critics that already about the middle of the second century all the books in the vertically arranged list on page 175 had been translated into Latin. A study of Tertullian, as we have seen, clearly shows that already in his time there were Latin translations of biblical books in existence, and that they had then a considerable history behind them. Whether they were produced in Italy or not, they seem in the first instance to have been much more used in Africa, because Greek was only known to the few in that country. We may take it that all the books mentioned above as being cited in Tertullian existed by his time in one or more Latin translations. Now, it is not impossible that non-canonical books had even thus early been translated into Latin. It is quite certain, for instance, that both the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas had been translated into Latin before the year 300. But it is much more natural to suppose that if a book had been translated as early as the second century, it was because of its importance and recognised authority and the necessity that it should be accessible to the uncultured as well as to the cultured. Our existing forms of the Old-Latin version or versions of course bear no date. They represent various

fragments, of various date and of various strata of the version, and it will not be for some time yet that we shall be able to say that such and such a form dates from such and such a quarter of a century, and was produced in such and such place. So much progress has already been made, however, in the last generation, that hopes may be entertained that a real history of the Latin versions and revisions may yet be written. It is not unfair, perhaps, in the circumstances to reason back from Cyprian and Novatian (*circa* 250) to what was the state of affairs a generation or a generation and a half earlier. In these writers, particularly in Cyprian, of whose works much more has survived, we find the following books quoted in Latin as authoritative: the Four Gospels, Acts, thirteen Pauline Epistles, First Peter, First John,[1] and the Apocalypse. Novatian, like Tertullian, refers to Hebrews as the work of Barnabas. Till the fourth century these two authors alone in the West make any reference to that Epistle. Our list is therefore identical with that arrived at from a study of the Fathers of that period.

The only other translation belonging for certain to this early date is that of the Syriac, and we can speak only of the Gospels. Tatian's Greek Diatessaron, translated by himself into Syriac about the year 170, is the only form of the Gospels which had wide vogue in the Assyrian Church at this period. But not later than 200, it would appear, and some think even earlier than the Diatessaron, the four 'Separated Gospels' were translated into the same language. In both cases it is our four canonical Gospels, and no others, that are used. It is highly probable that Tatian also translated a Western text of the Epistles of St. Paul for the use of the Assyrian Church.

The Canon which we know was then for most of its books already settled before the middle of the third century, and, we might say, probably seventy-five years before that even.

[1] Second John is quoted by an African contemporary of Cyprian, and carries with it Third John.

CHAPTER IV

BOOKS OF TEMPORARY AND LOCAL CANONICITY

ONE of the most interesting parts of this subject is that of books which had canonicity, or something very like it, in a particular church for a particular period, but were afterwards dropped. This seems the best point at which to consider such, because it was of course in the early period that these books were most numerous. With the lapse of time, the greater interchange of opinion between churches and the greater centralisation, which went on *pari passu* with the dismemberment of the great Roman Empire, and the ecclesiastical friendship between its halves, the state of uniformity was reached which we see to-day.

It is not of course possible for us to give a complete account of all the works treated at any time as canonical in any part of the Roman Empire. All that we can do is to collect the scattered notices that have survived on this subject, and these shall be taken book by book.

The TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES (Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων), compiled from a Jewish work called *The Two Ways* and certain biblical books, was written probably early in the second century.[1] The original work, *The Two Ways*, seems to have been even more widely used in Christian circles than the longer work. It professes to record what the Apostles taught to the Gentiles, and alike its brevity and its consonance with the general voice of apostolic tradition brought it considerable esteem in early times. The Didache is used both by Clement of Alex-

[1] Compare the classical article 'Didache,' by Professor Bartlet, in the extra volume of Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*; on the considerable use of the New Testament (Paul, Matthew, Luke, John) made in it, see the Dean of Wells in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. xiii. (1911-12), pp. 339-56, and cf. Sanday, *Inspiration*, p. 301.

andria and by Origen as Holy Scripture, and during the following century there is clear evidence that in Egypt, and there only, it continued to be so used. But there is evidence of its existence elsewhere also. In Syrian Antioch it was employed in the composition of the *Apostolic Constitutions* (third or fourth century). In recent times a Latin translation has turned up, but canonical use either in Syria or in Latin-speaking countries is improbable. Certain of the Greek lists recognise it in various positions, in the fourth century and later.

The EPISTLE OF BARNABAS, so-called, had in Egypt something like a canonical position. Clement of Alexandria, in his *Hypotyposes*, or commentary on the Catholic Epistles, of which only fragments have survived, commented on it. Origen calls it 'catholic,' a term which he elsewhere applies to 'First Peter' and 'First John,' and which for practical purposes may be identified with 'canonical.' At a later date it was ejected: yet it remains in ℵ.

The LETTER OF CLEMENT, sent from Rome about 96 A.D., as from the church at Rome to the church at Corinth, was highly and widely esteemed. In the only two *Greek* MSS. in which the epistle is preserved, the so-called Alexandrian MS. of the British Museum (of the fifth century) and the Jerusalem MS. (of the eleventh century), it is found combined with another document bearing the title of the *Second Letter of Clement*. But in the MS. of the Latin translation, in two MSS. of two separate Coptic translations, and in the MS. of the Syriac translation, it stands by itself.[1] This proves abundantly that there were also Greek MSS. in which it stood alone. We know that First Clement was read in public service at Corinth about 170. Irenaeus, Clement,[2] and Origen all testify to its value and make use of it. Other Egyptian writers, of the fourth and fifth centuries, show the same attitude. It was not, however, commented on by Clement of Alexandria in his *Hypotyposes*, highly as he esteemed it. As the writing of a sub-apostle,

[1] By this is meant merely 'without *Second* Clement.'

[2] Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iv. 105) calls it 'a writing of the apostle Clement.'

it was not held in the same esteem as that of the Apostle Barnabas. It does not appear that either of the two had any real canonical position in the West.

SECOND CLEMENT, which has nothing really to do with Clement of Rome, and may itself be of Egyptian origin,[1] is a homily, not a letter, probably written about the middle of the second century. It is, as we have said, found only in two Greek biblical MSS. in conjunction with First Clement, and it has no sort of authority to compare with the genuine Clement. It was rarely read, only here and there, and only in the East. The West has no knowledge of it.

The SHEPHERD OF HERMAS is used as Holy Scripture by Irenaeus, Tertullian (before his conversion to Montanism), and Clement of Alexandria, which is the more remarkable, seeing that it is, perhaps, of all writings regarded as biblical the latest to be composed. But immediately after this time its authority was severely canvassed in the great churches of Rome and Carthage, and its summary rejection followed. The Muratorian Canon reflects the esteem in which the work was held at the time that list was compiled. One Roman contemporary of Cyprian cites it as 'divina scriptura,' and another speaks of it as a recognised book of teaching. Knowledge of it appears as late as the Gallic fifth-century Christian versifier, Commodian.

The APOCALYPSE OF PETER, so-called, was commented on by Clement in his *Hypotyposes*, and seems to have been widely used, especially in the East. In the Claromontane list, as well as various lists of undoubted oriental origin, it is to be found in a subordinate position, being sometimes mentioned last of all. The Church historian Sozomen tells us that about 430 it was read on Easter Eve in certain churches of Palestine. No certain use of it in the West was known to Zahn eight years ago, but a brilliant discovery of the young Benedictine, Dom André Wilmart, has proved that it was known there too. In a Latin tractate on *The Ten Virgins*, belonging probably to the end of the third century, which he has published with introduction and

[1] Bartlet in Preuschen's *Zeitschr. f. n.t. Wiss.* vii. (1906), pp. 123 ff.

notes,[1] the following words occur : '*Ostium clausum* flumen igneum est quo impii regno dei arcebuntur, ut apud Danihelum et apud Petrum—in Apocalypsi eius—scriptum est.'[2]

The Acts of Paul. This orthodox work, which has come down to us incomplete in a Coptic translation,[3] includes the well-known Acts of Paul and Thecla, as well as a suppositious correspondence between the Apostle and the church of Corinth, both of which parts circulated later also independently. The complete work was compiled out of the canonical Acts and knowledge of localities in Asia Minor by a well-meaning presbyter of the province of Asia, in the middle of the second century, who on confessing his authorship was deposed from his office. Origen certainly, and Clement of Alexandria probably, have cited this work with respect, and it is found in various oriental lists. It seems to have been esteemed all over the Church. The so-called Third Epistle to the Corinthians had full canonicity among the Syrians of the fourth century, and is commented on by Ephraim. In the West the Acts of Paul does not seem ever to have been canonical, but the work has nevertheless been used by Hippolytus (in the first half of the third century) and by 'Ambrosiaster' (in the second half of the fourth century), both Roman writers.[4] An opinion contrary to the usual favourable one is, however, expressed by Pseudo-Cyprian *De Rebaptismate*, a work of uncertain date and provenance.[5]

Epiphanius (about 380) tells that here and there Pseudo-Clement *De Virginitate* was read in church services.[6]

This concludes the list of attested works which were either canonical or next thing to it.

[1] From the Epinal MS. 68 (formerly of Moyenmoutier, and earlier still of Murbach, in Elsass) of the eighth century; *Bulletin d'archéologie et de littérature chrétiennes*, vol. i. (1911), p. 5 of the *tirage à part*, which I owe to the author's courtesy.

[2] Cf. Dr. M. R. James in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, xii. (1910-11), pp. 41, 43.

[3] Ed. C. Schmidt, Ausg. 1 (Leipzig, 1904), Ausg. 2 (Leipzig, 1905).

[4] See Zahn, *Grundriss*, p. 26, for Hippolytus, and Schmidt, *op. cit.*, Ausg. 2, p. 157, for 'Ambrosiaster': cf. also Wilmart, *Rev. Bénéd.* 1910, 402 ff.

[5] Zahn, *op. cit.*, p. 26, n. 19.

[6] *Haer.* xxx. 15, cited by Leipoldt, *Gesch. des neut. Canons*, i. p. 250.

CHAPTER V

FROM ORIGEN TO CHRYSOSTOM IN THE EAST

ORIGEN (185 [186]-255 [254]) was a native of Alexandria, and successor of Clement in the headship of the catechetical school there. He worked in that capacity from 203 to 215 (216) with an enthusiasm and a devotion which are made clear to us by the voluminous writings which, without this period spent in preparation and teaching, would never have seen the light. He had travelled extensively, having visited Rome, Athens, Syria, Cappadocia, and Arabia. Everywhere he made himself acquainted with the biblical literature in use, and acquired a knowledge of all the existing types of text. Much of his later life was spent at Caesarea in Palestine, where his collection of rolls was preserved after his death.

He had thus unexampled facilities for the acquirement of a knowledge of what works were canonical in every part of the Roman Empire. We do not find, however, that he himself caused any change to be made, and this is the best proof that in his time the question was already universally settled with regard to the majority of New Testament writings. It was in the directions of text and interpretation that his real life's work was performed. But he divides the 'books of the church' (*βιβλία ἐκκλησιαστικά*) into those 'recognised everywhere' (*ὁμολογούμενα* [1]), and such as are in certain churches disputed. Amongst the *ὁμολογούμενα* he gives the four Gospels, thirteen letters of Paul, First Peter, First John, Acts, and the Apocalypse. The Apocalypse was to him also the last book in the New Testament.

[1] Passages in Zahn, *Grundr.*, p. 42, n. 3.

The disputed works according to him were Hebrews (which he himself, especially in his earlier works, cites as Pauline and canonical); Second Peter (which he himself, if we may trust the Latin translations of his commentaries, regarded as genuine and as Holy Scripture); Second and Third John (here he expresses real doubts as to the genuineness); James (often cited by him,[1] but its want of general recognition is admitted); Jude (nearly always cited as Holy Scripture and highly valued, but he once mentions that doubts were entertained about it); the Letter of Barnabas (on a level with the other Catholic Epistles, and the adjective is definitely applied to it);[2] the Shepherd of Hermas (treated by him as Scripture, but without silence as to the doubts which had been raised about its canonicity); the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles (for Origen personally, as for the church of Alexandria, canonical, but not received everywhere). The Gospel according to the Hebrews, the only Gospel of the Jewish Christian communities, is for him a disputed work in the Church as a whole.

The earliest New Testament in the Assyrian Church was much smaller than that accepted by Origen, containing as it did only 'the Gospel,' the Epistles of Paul, and Acts. The explanation of this is probably, as we have hinted already, the fact that the Canon came from Tatian, who introduced (about 172) probably only those books which were commonly accepted in the church of Rome. In this enumeration 'the Gospel' means Tatian's Diatessaron. The fourth-century Syriac writers, like Aphraates and Ephraim, confine their quotations to the books named. There are certain peculiarities about the collection of Pauline Epistles used by them which makes it probable that some development had occurred between Tatian's time and the fourth century. At the latter period Hebrews was recognised as Pauline, and in this fact one may see Alexandrian influence. Also the apocryphal Third Epistle

[1] He is in fact the earliest writer to cite this Epistle, which I believe to be an Egyptian product of the second century.

[2] Compare last chapter, p. 179.

to the Corinthians was recognised, and Philemon, as short and unimportant, appears to have been omitted.[1] The order of the Pauline Epistles in Marcion and the Syriac Canon, printed as Document O (2), is compared with that in Ephraim († 373) by Zahn [2] as follows [3]:

MARCION	EPHRAIM	SYRIAC CANON (*ca.* 400)
Gal.	Gal.	Gal.
1 Cor.	1 Cor.	1 Cor.
2 Cor.	2 Cor.	2 Cor.
	3 Cor.	
Rom.	Rom.	Rom.
	Hebr.	Hebr.
1 Thess.		
2 Thess.		
Laod.	Eph.	Col.
Col.	Phil.	Eph.
Phil.	Col.	Phil.
	1 Thess.	1 Thess.
	2 Thess.	2 Thess.
	1 Tim.	1 Tim.
	2 Tim.	2 Tim.
	Tit.	Tit.
Philem.		Philem.

The resemblances and differences between these lists are alike significant, and represent various strata in canonisation. There can be no doubt that the order of the Epistles at the beginning is ultimately due to Marcion. The tradition of the Assyrian Church was that they had got them from Rome, and their textual character, which shows affinities with the Western text in the geographical sense,

[1] But we learn from Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Jerome that the genuineness of the epistle was seriously questioned by some; the Assyrian Church may have been among these. Zahn conjectures, perhaps rightly, that Tatian himself rejected it (*Grundr.*, pp. 51 f.).

[2] *Grundr.*, p. 49.

[3] I venture to disagree from Zahn, however, in my view as to the original text of the canon.

where it disagrees with the Peshitta, shows that this is true. No doubt Tatian was the intermediary.[1]

This state of matters lasted until the period of Rabbula, Bishop of Edessa from 411 to 435, who decided to provide the Assyrian Church with a New Testament up to date in text and contents. He therefore adopted the Canon current in Antioch and Antiochian circles at the time, and had the Old-Syriac translation of the separated Gospels, which had had only a limited vogue, and of the Epistles and Acts, revised textually[2] in accordance with the New Antiochian type of text. He also caused the Antiochian text of James, First Peter, and First John to be translated into Syriac, and thus was constituted his New Testament of twenty-two books. It was not till the beginning of the sixth century that the remaining five were translated by order of Philoxenus, and the Syriac New Testament thus made identical with our own in contents.[3]

If we pass from the Euphrates country to Syria, we find there active in our period Lucian and Eusebius. Lucian was born in Samosata in Syria and trained at Edessa. He afterwards became priest in Antioch and founded a school: he was martyred at Nicomedia, 7th January 312. His life's work was a revised text of the Old and New Testaments. His recension of the New Testament spread from Antioch to Constantinople, and is probably the parent of the great bulk of our Greek MSS. The old Antiochian Canon had included the Apocalypse and, apparently, Second Peter. Under the influence of Lucian and his school the Antioch Canon of the fourth century, on which, as we have seen, the Peshitta Syriac was based, excluded the Apocalypse and Second Peter, Second and Third John, and Jude. This is the Canon which Constantinople, the daughter of Antioch in the ecclesiastical sense, recognised, as we find

[1] I would respectfully associate myself with the convincing argument of Zahn, *Grundr.*, pp. 50 f.

[2] Of course Third Corinthians was ejected, and Philemon included, if not already present.

[3] See above, p. 61.

from the writings of Chrysostom, Metropolitan of Constantinople about 400, and others.

Eusebius of Caesarea (*ca.* 265-339 [340]) was the inheritor of the library and of the traditions of Origen, through his adopted father Pamphilus the Martyr. Following Origen, he sought to ascertain the usages of all churches with regard to the New Testament books. Those recognised by him (that is by the churches as a whole), on the basis of this wide knowledge, are the four Gospels, Acts, the Epistles of Paul, First John, First Peter, and the Apocalypse.[1] Among those that are disputed, but known to the majority, are the so-called Epistle of James, the Epistles of Jude, Second Peter, and the so-called Second and Third Epistles of John, 'whether they are the work of the evangelist, or of another man of the same name.' Amongst the disputed but spurious works are the Acts of Paul, the so-called Shepherd [of Hermas] and the Apocalypse of Peter, and, in addition, the Epistle which passes under the name of Barnabas, and the so-called Teachings (*sic*) of the Apostles; to these, perhaps, the Apocalypse ought to be added, as some reject it, while others think it ought to be accepted. Some would further add the Gospel according to the Hebrews, in which Hebrew Christians especially delight. These, he says, would be all among the disputed writings. Then he enumerates some 'heretical' writings that are outwith consideration altogether: the Gospels of Peter, Thomas, Matthias, etc., the Acts of Andrew, John, and the rest of the Apostles. This is the principal declaration of Eusebius on the subject of the Canon, with which occasional remarks of his do not in all points tally; but the significance of this fact is that he is not giving his private view, but a kind of synoptic view of the attitude of the whole Church, so far as he knows it. His own preference, for instance, was distinctly for the ejection of the Apocalypse. In this respect, and in this alone, then, is there a real difference between Eusebius' New Testament and ours. He is followed by Cyril of Jerusalem, etc.

[1] *Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 25, 1 ff.

Let us turn to Egypt again. There is some reason to suppose that the Sahidic version of the New Testament was made as early as the third century.[1] If, therefore, we could say what the translation in its original form contained, we should be justified in inferring that those and those alone were the canonical books in the Greek-speaking churches of Egypt at that time. But, though every book in our New Testament is represented in some Sahidic fragment or other, these fragments are of such various date that it is impossible to argue as to the contents of the original Sahidic canon. It is probable that it contained the Apocalypse.[2]

The most interesting fourth-century Egyptian document with reference to the Canon is the Easter Letter of Athanasius, written in 367.[3] The purpose Athanasius had in compiling the list of biblical books was to exclude the large number of apocryphal books, which were very much read, just as they had been to a great extent written, by Egyptian Christians. Athanasius' significance for us is that *he is the earliest to lay down the twenty-seven books of our New Testament as alone canonical.* There is no hesitation, for instance, about either Second Peter or the Apocalypse. Amongst those that may be read by catechumens he gives 'the so-called Teaching of the Apostles and the Shepherd,' and these alone of books anywhere associated with the New Testament. This last part seems to have been a concession to conservatism, and the distinction between books to be read by catechumens and those to be read in the public regular services of the church of Alexandria, was one that was sure to break down. These catechumens' books fell into disuse, but the other canon has attained world-wide sway.

At this point one may sum up the after-history of the Canon in the Eastern Church, though the title of the chapter does not take us beyond Chrysostom. Theodore

[1] But personally I should prefer to agree with Leipoldt, *Gesch. d. neut. Canons*, i. p. 81, who gives the first half of the fourth century.
[2] Leipoldt, *op. cit.*, i. p. 81, against Westcott, *Canon*, ed. 7, p. 376.
[3] See the Appendix, Document E.

of Mopsuestia (340[?]-428), one of the most learned and voluminous writers of the Antiochian school, took a somewhat independent line in canonical matters. As an Antiochian he naturally rejected the Apocalypse, but in addition he excluded all the Catholic Epistles. He arranged, too, the Epistles of St. Paul in the following order: Romans, First Corinthians, Second Corinthians, Hebrews, Ephesians, Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, First and Second Thessalonians, and then the Pastorals and Philemon. His influence in matters of canon, as in other ways, is to be traced among his great admirers, the Nestorian Assyrian Church. There is evidence that, following his lead, some of them, at least, rejected all the Catholic Epistles. Again, in Junilius, the African Latin author of the sixth century, who reports somewhat freely the lectures delivered by Paul of Nisibis at Constantinople about 545, we find James coupled with the four small Catholic epistles as of secondary authority, to be clearly distinguished from First Peter and First John.

By the beginning of the sixth century a change must have been produced. The Syriac translation made about 508 of the four smaller Catholic epistles and the Apocalypse proves that by then these had come once again into favour in Greek-speaking Syrian churches. About the same period the attitude of Asia Minor to the Apocalypse also appears changed, for at that date Andreas of Caesarea in Cappadocia writes a commentary on the Apocalypse as an inspired book. About 530 the Jerusalem scholar Leontius speaks of the Apocalypse as the last canonical book in the New Testament. At this period, then, the whole Greek-speaking church seems to have been in line with the canon as we know it. Conciliar judgments are considered in a later chapter.

CHAPTER VI

FROM 250 TO 450 IN THE WEST

So far as we can say, the West appears to have taken a line of its own during the very earliest centuries of the Church in matters of Canon as in others. It was not till towards the middle of the fourth century that the Arian controversy brought East and West orthodox Christians together. At the beginning of our period we have already seen what the canon of Cyprian of Carthage contained. We have no reason to suppose that the canon of Rome differed materially from that of Cyprian at that time, as Africa probably derived her Christianity and everything connected with it directly from Italy. We should expect Spain to follow Africa, Gaul and Dalmatia to follow Rome, and that appears to be what happened. Our object in this chapter will be to summarise the attitude displayed by Christian authors in the golden age of Latin Christian literature towards books which are absent from the canon of Cyprian, and are now in our New Testament. As a postulate at the beginning of our investigation we may state that no book accepted by Cyprian was rejected by after ages.

The books absent from the Cyprianic[1] canon are: (Philemon[2]), Hebrews, James, Second Peter, Second John, Third John, Jude. Let us take these books in turn, and, going down through the leading authors of the period

[1] It is said that Firmicus Maternus (*ca.* 340), Zeno of Verona (*ca.* 360-380?), and Commodian (*ca.* 465) derive their Scripture passages exclusively from Cyprian's *Testimonies*.

[2] The absence of Philemon is accidental, and due solely to its shortness and its special character.

from 250 to 450, endeavour to trace the use and estimate the position of these various books, one by one. Our task will be in a measure tentative. Only some of the authors have yet been edited in a manner satisfying to modern requirements, and even when that has been done, one cannot always rely on an editor's knowledge of Scripture, or on the accuracy of his index of Scripture passages.[1]

The Epistle to the Hebrews

The following authorities pass over Hebrews in silence: the African canon (*ca.* 360), Optatus of Mileue in Numidia (370-85), the Acts of the Donatist controversy, Zeno of Verona, an African by birth, Foebadius of Agen (*ob. post* 392).

Hilary of Poitiers (*ob.* 366) in his *Tract. in Psalm. CXXIX.* (written perhaps about 360), § 7, quotes Hebrews i. 14, and introduces his quotation by the words 'maxime cum scriptum sit.' This shows that he regarded the work as canonical; but there is no word of Paul's name. In an earlier passage of the same work (*in Psalm. CXXIV.* § 4) he works in language from Hebr. xii. 22-3 without in any way citing the words from their context. Hilary's attitude is that of compromise. He was deeply imbued with Eastern learning, and to him Hebrews was a canonical book, but he knew the attitude of his Western countrymen with regard to it. 'Ambrosiaster,' perhaps Isaac, a converted Jew (*flor.* 370-85) of Rome (and Spain ?), uses the epistle as canonical, but always as an anonymous work.[2] The attitude of Ambrose of Milan (340-97) is at times the same. In the case of Ambrose it must have been due to prudence that he sometimes took this attitude; for, as one who derived principally from Greek authors, he must have been well acquainted with the other attitude. Other writers who quote or appear to quote Hebrews as an anonymous work are Rufinus of Aquileia (345-410).

[1] There are errors, for instance, in Hartel's index to Lucifer of Cagliari.

[2] This fact was first discovered by the present writer; see *Study of Ambrosiaster*, pp. 171 ff., 197.

Augustine's attitude, which is particularly interesting, was first clearly traced by the great Augustine expert, the late Dom Odilo Rottmanner of Munich.[1] In his earliest writings (down to 406) he cites the Epistle as Paul's; in the middle period he wavers between Pauline authorship and anonymity; in his old age (409-30) he refers to it always as anonymous. Everywhere, of course, in his writings it is a canonical book. It is never cited in the Pseudo-Augustinian *Speculum*, a work probably not later than the beginning of the fifth century, written in Spain or North Africa. Isidore of Seville in the seventh century is probably referring to the past rather than the present, when he says that very many Latins doubt the Pauline authorship.[2]

On the other side, the following authors cite Hebrews as canonical and as the work of St. Paul: Marius Victorinus of Rome (*ca.* 360), Lucifer of Cagliari (*ob.* 371), Priscillian of Zaragoza (wrote between 380 and 385), Faustinus of Rome (*flor.* 380-4), Filaster of Brescia (*ca.* 383), Pacian of Barcelona (*flor.* 360-90), Jerome of Stridon (Dalmatia) and Rome (*ca.* 340-420), Paulinus of Nola (353-431), Pelagius of Britain (*ca.* 350-*ca.* 430), Cassian of Marseilles (*ca.* 360-*ca.* 435), and Julian of Aeclanum (*flor.* 420).

The Epistle of James

The Western Church is absolutely silent about this Epistle till the second half of the fourth century. The oldest quotation from it is in Hilary of Poitiers (*ob.* 366), the next oldest is in Ambrosiaster[3]; then follow [the 'Damasine' canon of 382],[4] Priscillian, Jerome, Augustine, Pelagius, Cassian and Paulinus of Nola. The Pseudo-

[1] See his paper in the *Revue Bénédictine*, xviii. (1901), pp. 257 ff., reprinted in *Geistesfrüchte aus der Klosterzelle* (München, 1908), pp. 84-90.

[2] *Etymol.* vi. 2, 45.

[3] This was first pointed out by the present writer (*Study of Ambrosiaster*, p. 197) in contradiction of the statement in Zahn, *Grundriss*, p. 69. Sabatier would have kept him right (see his *Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae . . .* [Remis, 1743], tom iii. *ad loc.*). The Ambrosiaster citation did not escape Hort (cf. his posthumous commentary on *James* [London, 1910], p. xxix).

[4] See postscript to the Preface.

Augustinian *Speculum* also cites it. The influence of Jerome and Augustine was sufficient to secure its unquestioned acceptance after their date.

Second Peter

The earliest citations of this Epistle in Latin are in Ambrosiaster,[1] Priscillian, and Filaster. The African [and 'Damasine'] canons give it, and Jerome and Augustine cite it abundantly. Pelagius, Cassian, the Pseudo-Augustinian *Speculum*, and others have no hesitation in using it as Scripture. After that generation its position is secure.

Second and Third John

Bishop Aurelius of Cillani (Numidia) cites Second John as the work of the Apostle at the Carthaginian Synod of 256. It is also quoted as such by Lucifer, Ambrosiaster, Optatus, Priscillian, and the Pseudo-Augustinian *Speculum*. The (African [2]) [and 'Damasine'] canons, Jerome and Augustine have it, just as they have all the other Catholic Epistles.[3]

Third John is recognised by the African canon (with hesitation), is alluded to as canonical by Ambrosiaster,[4] [appears in the 'Damasine' canon], but is apparently cited nowhere before Jerome and Augustine. Its special connexion with the circumstances referred to in it explains its uselessness for general purposes of quotation.

The Epistle of Jude

This Epistle was received both in Rome and in Carthage about 200, but after that period seems to have fallen into disrepute. No African writer between Tertullian and

[1] First pointed out by the present writer (*Study of Ambrosiaster*, pp. 196 f.) in contradiction of Zahn, *loc. cit.*

[2] The African with hesitation.

[3] The African canon is of course entirely without James and Jude.

[4] First pointed out by the present writer (*Study of Ambrosiaster*, p. 197) in contradiction of Zahn, *loc. cit.*

Augustine quotes it, and the African canon of 360 passes it over. Cassiodorus' copy of the *Antiqua Translatio* in the middle of the sixth century had all the other books in our New Testament except it. However, Lucifer, Ambrosiaster, Priscillian, [the 'Damasine' canon], Filaster, the Pseudo-Augustinian *Speculum*, Cassian, and later writers cite it as Scripture.

NOTE

THE EPISTLE TO THE LAODICENES

Not later than the fourth century a forger, misunderstanding the passage Col. iv. 16, composed a (Latin?) epistle as from St. Paul to the church at Laodicea. It is a cento from the genuine Epistles. A large number of Latin manuscripts of the *Epistles* contain it.[1] It is first found in the Pseudo-Augustinian *Speculum*, was recognised as genuine, but not canonical, by Gregory the Great, and was early translated into English. It is recognised by Alfric, Abbot of Cerne (989 A.D.), and finds a place in various early Bibles of modern European peoples.[2] It runs thus:—

I. Paulus apostolus, non ab homine neque per hominem, sed per Iesum Christum, fratribus qui sunt Laudiciae; gratia uobis et pax a deo patre et domino nostro Iesu Christo. gratias ago Christo per omnem orationem meam, quod estis permanentes in eo et perseuerantes in operibus eius, sperantes promissionem in die iudicationis.[3] neque destituat uos quorundam uaniloquentia insinuantium se: sed peto (ut) ne uos auertant a ueritate euangelii quod a me praedicatur. et nunc deus faciet ut sint qui sunt ex me in profectum ueritatis euangelii deseruientes et facientes benignitatem operum quae sunt salutis uitae aeternae.

II. Et nunc sunt palam uincula mea, quae patior in Christo, quibus laetor et gaudeo; et hoc mihi est ad salutem perpetuam, quod ipsum factum orationibus uestris administrante sancto spiritu siue per uitam siue per mortem. est enim mihi uiuere in

[1] It is edited by Lightfoot, *Colossians*, pp. 285 ff., and Westcott, *Canon* (ed. 7), pp. 591 ff., to whose editions I am indebted. Harnack also edited it in 1905 in Lietzmann's *Kleine Texte* (xii.). It is desirable that a complete list of MSS. containing it should be made.

[2] See details in Westcott, *op. cit.*, pp. 464 ff.

[3] This is very rare for *iudicii*.

Christo et mori gaudium ; et ipsum in uobis faciet misericordia sua, ut eandem dilectionem habeatis et sitis unianimes.

III. Ergo, dilectissimi, ut audistis praesentiam mei, ita retinete et facite in timore dei, et erit uobis uita aeterna ; est enim deus qui operatur in uobis ; et facite sine retractatione quaecumque facitis.

IV. Et quod est optimum, dilectissimi, gaudete in Christo et praecauete sordidos in lucro. in omnibus sint petitiones uestrae palam ante deum, et estote firmi in sensu Christi. et quae integra et pudica et iusta et casta et amabilia , facite, et quae audistis et accepistis in corde retinete, et erit uobis pax. salutate omnes sanctos in osculo sancto. salutant uos omnes sancti. gratia domini nostri Iesu Christi cum spiritu uestro. et facite legi Colosensibus et Colosensium uobis.

CHAPTER VII

CONCILIAR DELIVERANCES

So far as biblical books were concerned, individual churches were permitted to exercise their own discretion in the earliest centuries of the Church. That a remarkable agreement of opinion was produced without any application of force is very significant. Something like a fixed canon had grown to have all the force of usage, and it was not till the second half of the fourth century that, from whatever cause or causes, this usage was stereotyped by various episcopal pronouncements made applicable to all the churches of a province or to the whole Church catholic.

What is, perhaps, the earliest of all these deliverances is that of the COUNCIL OF LAODICEA in 363 A.D. Bishop Westcott, however, in a masterly chapter, has shown that the list of Scriptural books attached to certain forms of the Canons of the Council of Laodicea is no integral part of these canons themselves,[1] and it must remain open to question whether the list is a contemporary appendix, or a later accretion. If the latter be the case, then the claim of the Council of Laodicea to have made the earliest conciliar list of Scripture books must be resigned in favour of the next council on our list, that of Damasus at Rome in 382. [But see below, under document G.]

Laodicean Canon LIX. reads : ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἰδιωτικοὺς ψαλμοὺς λέγεσθαι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, οὐδὲ ἀκανόνιστα βιβλία, ἀλλὰ μόνα τὰ κανονικὰ τῆς καινῆς καὶ παλαιᾶς διαθήκης.

ὅσα δεῖ βιβλία ἀναγινώσκεσθαι· παλαιᾶς διαθήκης . . . τὰ δὲ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης· εὐαγγέλια δ΄, κατὰ Ματθαῖον, κατὰ

[1] The list is absent from the Latin version by Dionysius Exiguus and from three Syriac MSS. in the British Museum (Westcott, ed. 7, p. 549, n. 2).

Μᾶρκον, κατὰ Λουκᾶν, κατὰ Ἰωάννην. Πράξεις Ἀποστόλων. Ἐπιστολαὶ Καθολικαὶ ἑπτά· οὕτως· Ἰακώβου α'. Πέτρου α', β'. Ἰωάννου α', β', γ'. Ἰούδα α'. Ἐπιστολαὶ Παύλου ιδ'. πρὸς Ῥωμαίους α'. πρὸς Κορινθίους α'. β'. πρὸς Γαλάτας α'. πρὸς Ἐφεσίους α'. πρὸς Φιλιππησίους α'. πρὸς Κολασσαεῖς α'. πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς α'. β'. πρὸς Ἑβραίους α'. πρὸς Τιμόθεον α', β'. πρὸς Τίτον α'. πρὸς Φιλήμονα α'.

This list is identical with that in the contemporary Festal Letter of Athanasius (Document E), except that here the Apocalypse is absent. This fact suggests that if the list be not contemporary with the Council, it is not more than a century later (see chapter v. page 185).

[In the Damasine Council (or Synod) of 382, held at Rome, in which Jerome was a leading spirit, and in which a list of Scripture books was promulgated (but see Document G), perhaps for the first time, we find exactly the same books given (neither more nor less) as in the Festal Letter of Athanasius and in our modern Bibles, though there are some differences in the order of groups and the order of individual writings within the groups. The 'Damasine' order is Gospels, Pauline Epistles (with Hebrews), the Apocalypse, Acts, Canonical Epistles. The individual Gospels are given in our order, which, as we have seen, goes back at least as far as Irenaeus. There are some peculiarities in the order of the Pauline Epistles, and amongst the Canonical Epistles the Petrine have the first place, as we should expect in the church at Rome. Second and Third John are by 'alter Iohannes presbyter.']

Fifteen years later (397) a Council was held at Carthage, at which Augustine was present. This Council also published a list of Scriptural books (Document K). There is an interesting difference between this and the 'Damasine' list, in respect of the Epistle to the Hebrews. In the 'Damasine' list it appears at the end, after Philemon, in the ordinary numeration. But in the Carthaginian list, 'Epistles of Paul the Apostle, 13,' is followed by 'eiusdem ad Hebraeos una.' There was then, even at the end of the fourth century, a certain reluctance on the part of the

African churches to recognise that Epistle as Paul's. The three Johannine Epistles are grouped together.

Both in the 'Damasine' and Carthaginian lists the books of our New Testament, neither more nor less, are recognised. After this double pronouncement of two such centres as Rome and Carthage, backed by the scholarship of Jerome and Augustine respectively, there could no longer be much question of disagreement in the West. We can therefore pass over a period of a thousand years, merely remarking that the reign of Charlemagne was in all ecclesiastical matters an unifying force, and come to the Council of Trent.

The real significance of the Council of Trent for the student of the Canon lies in two things. The Scriptures are a repository of apostolic and spiritual truth, of which one God is author, and a list of these writings is given, so that no doubt as to any particular book may arise. The list is identical with that of 'Damasus' Council,' save that now there is only one John, and the order of groups and books is different. In the second place, mention is made of a particular version, probably for the first time in the history of the Church. 'The whole books with all their parts, as they have been accustomed to be read in the Catholic church, and *as they are contained in the old Vulgate Latin edition*,' are to be regarded as 'sacri et canonici,' and a curse is invoked on him who does not so regard them.

CHAPTER VIII

THE REFORMATION AND LATER

THROUGHOUT the Middle Ages the Church held to the Canon as it had become fixed in the early years of the fifth century. It did so because it was the finding of the Church. The history of the Middle Ages is the history of the gradually attained supremacy of the Church of Rome over the whole of the Western Church. As Rome had settled views on the Canon by the beginning of the fifth century, these, as a matter of course, gradually imposed themselves on the entire Church. So great has this influence been, that even the Reformed Churches have simply retained the New Testament Canon of the Roman Catholic Church. The real difference between the Roman and other communions consists in the attitude to the Canon. To the Roman Catholic the Church is the supreme authority, speaking through its Chief Pontiff; Scripture is one fountain of doctrine, side by side with the creeds, the decrees of councils, and the opinions of the Fathers of the Church. Had Scripture played a more important part in the Church of Rome, it is possible that the resulting attitude of the Reformers would have been different. But, as what the Reformers attacked especially was the excessive authority attributed to the Church, they had to find the seat of authority elsewhere, and, as some one has said, 'they substituted for an infallible Church an infallible Book.' There are not wanting signs that in future stress will be laid neither on an infallible Church, nor on an infallible Book, but on an infallible Christ.

The changed attitude to Scripture was only part of the

great phenomenon known as the Reformation. This is not the place, even if the writer were qualified, to give any account of the Reformation,[1] but among the causes which operated upon men's views of Scripture was the recovery of the original Greek of the New Testament in the West. Many men had so come to hate the evil side of the Church of Rome that they despised much in that Church which was really good and worthy in itself. The Latin Vulgate was despised in comparison with the original Greek, probably with the underlying idea that the Church of Rome had been guilty of fraud in making so much of the Vulgate. But the Church of Rome cannot really be blamed for continuing to use the only Bible that her members had been able to read for over a thousand years. Hardly any one in the West could read Greek before the fall of Constantinople in 1453. Even a generation after that, Erasmus could not find a teacher of the language for a long period, and tells us that, so far as Greek was concerned, he was 'prorsus αὐτοδίδακτος,' 'entirely self taught.'

It must be remembered that the Greek text published by Erasmus in 1516 was not unaccompanied. There was a preface, a new Latin translation, and there were many notes from that subtle and agile mind. These were in Latin, which all understood, and there can be little doubt that they worked a tremendous effect on the thought of the time. The Latin-reading public of that age was influenced by him somewhat in the same way as the English-reading public of our day has been influenced by the writings of George Bernard Shaw. They are alike in their suggestiveness and in their power to shake people out of their ordinary ways of thinking. Erasmus spoke quite freely about New Testament writings, denied the Pauline authorship of Hebrews, welcomed the Epistle of James to its place in the Canon, while thinking it in some respects

[1] The reader who has not already studied the history of the Reformation is recommended to begin with Professor M'Giffert's volume in the present series, and to go on to G. P. Fisher's *The Reformation* (London, 1873, and often later), and Principal T. M. Lindsay's two volumes, *History of the Reformation* (Edinburgh, 1906-7).

unworthy; and so on. It was the first step in the movement for judging Scripture as other ancient books are judged.

Erasmus' outspokenness was unwelcome to the Church, and he became somewhat more reserved as time advanced. Views like his were, however, promulgated by other Roman Catholics like Cardinal Caietanus and Sixtus Senensis. The Council of Trent's Decree was, in fact, as much aimed against teachers of this class as against anybody.

Nor was the attitude of Luther entirely different. He also, as is well known, criticised the Epistle of St. James, calling it a 'straw epistle,' and suggested—or revived a previous suggestion—that the Epistle to the Hebrews was the work of Apollos. Erasmus was rather a man of intellect, Luther rather a man of heart. Erasmus was sometimes misled by his own subtlety; Luther, who was rather a poor scholar, was so sound at the heart, so fervid in moral conviction, that he exercised influence in quarters where the influence of Erasmus was hardly appreciable. Luther tested all Scripture in relation to the central doctrine of Christianity, that all are sinners and on repentance and forgiveness are justified by God, this being an act of grace with which we have really nothing to do, and which we have done nothing to deserve. This doctrine is so cardinal and has such unsurpassed power of moving men, that it is naturally to be found either in germ or fully developed in every New Testament writing. The presence of this Divine wisdom, which could never have been excogitated by man, is the proof that the Bible is a Divine Book. It is the voice of God Himself. It is not in the Church, then, which we see to be corrupt, says Luther in effect, that we find the seat of authority, but in this Book written by men filled with a special inspiration from God Himself.

Thus the Reformed Churches have the same New Testament as the Church of Rome, but to them it means much more. They have as a whole repudiated the creeds of the Church of Rome except the Apostles'. They have little

respect for the opinions of the Fathers, and less still for the decrees of councils. They have thrown all of these overboard, and have staked all on the Scriptures alone.

Luther first popularised the subjective judgment of Scripture, and in accordance with his view of their value he relegated Hebrews, James, Jude, and the Apocalypse to the end of his Bible. In his list of books he numbered all except these, and a blank line precedes them. We are justified in concluding that Luther did not wish to give these writings full canonical authority. Of all the New Testament writings Luther esteemed the Pauline Epistles, St. John's Gospel, First John, and First Peter most highly.

William Tindale followed Luther very closely in these matters, but Coverdale and later translators were more conservative.

Andrew Bodenstein of Karlstadt, generally known now as KARLSTADT,[1] was originally a friend of Luther, but became alienated from him by theological controversies. He was a scholastic, a friend of humanism, and in his later life professor of theology at Basle (died 1541). In 1520 he published a little book in Latin called *De Canonicis Scripturis*, which he followed next year with one in the German vernacular entitled *What Books are Biblical?* These works were written against Rome. He repudiated conciliar decisions, and was the first to assert the independent supremacy of Holy Scripture. As a textual critic he was much under the influence of Erasmus, and like him was influenced by historical considerations. He divided New Testament documents into three classes according to dignity, but all these are superior to any others. His three classes are :—

(1) Four Gospels and Acts.
(2) Thirteen undoubted Epistles of Paul; First Peter, First John.
(3) Seven disputed works: James, Second Peter, Second and Third John, Jude, Hebrews, the Apocalypse.

[1] See especially Leipoldt, vol. ii. pp. 104-20. Westcott suffers somewhat here from inability to go to the fountainhead.

The authorship of James is not quite certain. In an implied criticism of Luther, which is suppressed in the German book, he speaks with respect of the Epistle. The authorship of Second Peter has been disputed without sufficient grounds. Second and Third John are not by John the Evangelist, but by another John, the Presbyter. Jude is not to be objected to because it quotes the Book of Enoch. Hebrews is not by Paul. Karlstadt doubts whether the Apocalypse should be in the Canon. These little books had very little influence over his contemporaries. The views expressed by him were mostly a repetition of Erasmus.

Huldreich ZWINGLI of Zürich (1484-1531), the great Swiss reformer, was a humanist like Karlstadt, and was interested in the New Testament mainly as an historical source. Nevertheless, he recognised that the Bible is principally a religious book, with occasional errors in matter of fact or history. He did not give much attention to canonical questions, and on the whole recognised equality of value in the New Testament writings. He rejected Luther's view of James, without mentioning his name; Hebrews was to him a work of Paul; but he rejected the Apocalypse, probably from personal antipathy, going so far as to say that it is not a book of the Bible.

Johannes OECOLAMPADIUS of Basle (1482-1531) received all our New Testament books and regarded Hebrews as Paul's, but he recognised that James, Second Peter, Second and Third John, Jude, and the Apocalypse are inferior to the rest.

John CALVIN of Geneva († 1564) applies the personal test like the others. To him the Church was based on Scripture, and is therefore not superior to it. He says nothing whatever of Second and Third John and the Apocalypse. The value of Hebrews is recognised, but the Pauline authorship is denied. He accepts James and Jude. Second Peter is not by Peter himself, but is a valuable work, written at Peter's command by one of his disciples.

Hugo GROTIUS, of Leyden (1583-1645), wrote *Annotationes* on the New Testament, which illustrate the freedom of Arminian criticism. Hebrews is by Luke. James is not apostolic, but written by James, the brother of the Lord, in the time of Claudius, and is a valuable document. Second Peter is not by the apostle Peter, but by Symeon, successor of James as head of the congregation at Jerusalem. Second and Third John are by the presbyter, not by the evangelist. Jude is the work of Judas, head of the Jerusalem congregation in the time of Hadrian: the clause 'brother of James' is a later interpolation. The Apocalypse is the work of the apostle John. Such freedom of speculation is rare before the nineteenth century, and is a kind of foreshadowing of the riotous criticism of Baur and the Tübingen school.

The ARTICLES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND (1562, 1571) are not explicit in regard to the contents of the New Testament Canon, but there can be no doubt whatever that they receive all our twenty-seven books and no others. The lack of explicitness is due not to any desire to leave freedom of choice, but merely to the fact that the question of the contents of the New Testament was closed.

The WESTMINSTER CONFESSION (1643) recognised all the books of our New Testament as canonical, 'given by inspiration of God to be the rule of faith and life.'

The NONCONFORMIST CHURCHES of England have been in this matter in entire agreement with the Church of England. Amidst much on which difference of opinion has been held, it is very gratifying that not only has the New Testament Canon been identical, but all the churches have used the same version of Scripture, and sung many of the same hymns. Here we have strong bases for that future union for which most Christians now look.

The last century has not taken much interest in the question of the Canon. The centre of interest has distinctly shifted. We see this in various ways. The old doctrine of verbal inspiration, which at the start of last century was practically universal in Presbyterian and Independent

churches, at least, has for the most part given way, under criticism, to a much more reasonable view. There has been, further, a much greater amount of free criticism of documents both inside and outside the Canon, quite irrespective of their canonicity. One might say that there has been rather an attempt to level up outside writings, like the Book of Enoch, to a canonical level, than to eject books which are already in the Canon. In other words, a prominent phase of modern study is to seek rather for what is common to New Testament and extra-canonical literature, than to bolster up New Testament books at the expense of those without. Certain books, also, in the New Testament, like Jude and Second and Third John, might almost be outside the Canon for all the use that is made of them either in public or in private.

Whether, on the basis of all the free criticism of documents in which the last century has indulged, there will be any attempt, or any successful attempt, on the part of any considerable section of the Church universal to reduce the number of books in the Canon, or to add to their number, or to do both, it is difficult to say. It seems to the present writer that modern conditions of ecclesiastical life foredoom such an attempt to failure. The interest in Scripture is in some ways perhaps greater than ever it was, but it is an historic, an intellectual interest, rather than the old passion for searching the Scriptures to get guidance for life. For many ministers now the selection of a text on which to preach is a mere form, a mere concession to usage. They have ceased to give Scripture that supreme place in literature, to regard it as *the* fount of divine wisdom, as their ancestors did. And yet all the criticism that there has been has not disproved the claim of some at least of these writings to be in close contact with the Saviour Himself, and the attitude to which we refer is reckless and wasteful of a precious heritage. We have ceased to be enslaved to the letter, but let us for that very reason be more deeply filled with the spirit behind the letter.

SELECTED DOCUMENTS

A

LATIN MARCIONITE PROLOGUES TO THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL

[These are contained in many MSS. of the Epistles of St. Paul in Latin, with or without commentaries on these Epistles. They are here given in the order in which they would appear in a Marcionite copy of the Apostle. Thus, and thus only, are they intelligible. For the text I am mainly[1] dependent on the editions of Dom Donatien de Bruyne, O.S.B., of the Abbey of Maredsous, Belgium, in the *Revue Bénédictine*, vol. xxiv. (1907), pp. 1-16, and of Dr. Peter Corssen of Berlin in the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Bd. x. (1909), pp. 37-9. The prologues will also be found printed in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, Bd. xxxii. (1907), 138 ff. (Harnack), and in Professor Burkitt's *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, second edition and later.]

Ad Galatas

Galatae sunt Graeci. Hi uerbum ueritatis[2] primum ab apostolo acceperunt sed post discessum eius temptati sunt a falsis apostolis ut in lege et circumcisione uerterentur. Hos apostolus reuocat ad fidem ueritatis,[3] scribens eis ab Epheso.

Ad Corinthios

Corinthii sunt Achaei. Et hi similiter ab apostolis audierunt uerbum ueritatis,[2] et subuersi multifarie a falsis apostolis, quidam a philosophiae uerbosa eloquentia,

[1] I have freely used collations of the following MSS. made by myself: Paris B.N. 653 (saec. viii.-ix., from North Italy), 1853 (saec. viii. ex.), Epinal 6 (saec. ix. in.).

[2] This expression comes from one of the following places: 2 Cor. vi. 7, Eph. i. 13, Col. i. 5, 2 Tim. ii. 15, James i. 18.

[3] From 2 Thess. ii. 13.

alii a secta legis Iudaicae inducti. Hos reuocat apostolus ad ueram et euangelicam sapientiam, scribens eis ab Epheso [per Timotheum].

Ad Romanos

Romani sunt in parte Italiae. Hi praeuenti a pseudoapostolis, sub nomine domini nostri Iesu Christi in lege et prophetis erant inducti. Hos reuocat apostolus ad ueram et euangelicam fidem, scribens eis ab Athenis.

Ad Thessalonicenses

Thessalonicenses sunt Macedones in Christo Iesu,[1] qui accepto uerbo ueritatis [2] perstiterunt in fide, etiam in persecutione ciuium suorum ; praeterea nec receperunt ea quae a falsis apostolis dicebantur. Hos conlaudat apostolus, scribens eis ab Athenis.

Ad Laodicenses

Laodicenses sunt Asiani. Hi accepto uerbo ueritatis [2] perstiterunt in fide. Hos conlaudat apostolus, scribens eis a Roma de carcere.

Ad Colosenses

Colosenses et hi, sicut Laodicenses, sunt Asiani. Et ipsi praeuenti erant a pseudoapostolis, nec ad hos accessit ipse apostolus, sed et hos per epistulam recorrigit : audierant enim uerbum ab Archippo, qui et ministerium [3] in eos accepit. Ergo apostolus iam ligatus scribit eis ab Epheso.

Ad Philippenses

Philippenses sunt Macedones. Hi accepto uerbo ueritatis [2] perstiterunt in fide, nec receperunt falsos apostolos. Hos apostolus conlaudat, scribens eis a Roma de carcere [per Epafroditum].

Ad Philemonem

Philemoni familiares litteras facit pro Onesimo seruo eius. Scribit autem ei a Roma de carcere.

[1] This phrase comes from 1 Thess. i. 1, 2 Thess. i. 1.
[2] See above. [3] Col. iv. 17.

[Catholic Additions.—For purposes of comparison the Catholic additions are added. 'Ephesios' was substituted for 'Laodicenses,' the Marcionite order of the Epistles was altered, and extra prologues were added for 2 Cor., 2 Thess., 1 Tim., 2 Tim., and Tit. The addition of a prologue to Hebrews was a still later stage, occurring probably not earlier than 350-80 A.D., and this is confirmed by the fact that six different prologues to this epistle have been found in Vulgate MSS. by De Bruyne (*op. cit.*, p. 7, n. 3).

Ad Corinthios II.

Post actam paenitentiam consolatorias[1] scribit eis a Troade, et conlaudans eos hortatur ad meliora.

Ad Thessalonicenses II.

Ad Thessalonicenses secundam[2] scribit et notum facit eis de temporibus nouissimis, et de aduersarii detectione. Scribit [hanc epistulam] ab Athenis.

Ad Timotheum I.

Timotheum instruit et docet de ordinatione episcopatus et diaconii et omnis ecclesiasticae disciplinae.

Ad Timotheum II.

Item Timotheo scribit de exhortatione martyrii et omnis regulae ueritatis,[3] et quid futurum sit temporibus nouissimis, et de sua passione.

Ad Titum

Titum commonefacit et instruit de constitutione presbyterii, et de spiritali conuersatione, et de hereticis uitandis, qui in scripturis Iudaicis credunt.]

It is highly probable that the capitula into which Latin MSS. of the Epistles of St. Paul are divided, and the lists of chapter headings with which they are provided, are also part of the equipment of this Marcionite 'Apostle,' and it would have been interesting, if the space had permitted, to print the text of these chapter headings here. Compare O. Schmid, *Über verschiedene Eintheilungen der heiligen Schrift* (Graz, 1892), Ed. Riggenbach in the *Neue Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, Bd. i. (1892), pp. 498-605, Bd. iii. (1894), pp. 350-63; P. Corssen in the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Bd. x. (1909), pp. 1-45, 97-102; De Bruyne in the *Revue Bénédictine*, xxv. (1908), pp. 423-30, xxviii.

[1] Understand, of course, *litteras*. [2] Understand *epistulam*.
[3] From the occurrence of this phrase one would judge that these Catholic prologues were composed not later than the middle of the third century A.D.

(1911), pp. 133-42. Nor must the earlier literature, such as the classic collection of Tommasi and Vezzosi, *opera omnia*, tom. i. (Rome, 1747), Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate* (Paris, 1893), pp. 357 ff., and *Les Préfaces jointes aux livres de la Bible*, etc. (Paris, 1902), pp. 64 f., be forgotten. A complete edition of the material is being prepared by Dom De Bruyne.

B

A MUTILATED ROMAN SECOND-CENTURY CANON, COMMONLY CALLED THE 'MURATORIAN'[1]

. . . . . .

quibus tamen interfuit et ita posuit.
Tertium euangelii librum secundum Lucan
Lucas iste medicus post ascensum Christi,
cum eum Paulus quasi adiutorem (?) studiosum
secum adsumsisset, nomine suo
ex opinione conscripsit : dominum tamen nec ipse
uidit in carne, et idem, prout assequi potuit,
ita et a natiuitate Iohannis incipit dicere.
Quartum euangeliorum Iohannes ex discipulis,
cohortantibus condiscipulis et episcopis suis,
dixit 'Conieiunate mihi hodie triduo, et quid
cuique fuerit reuelatum, alterutrum
nobis enarremus.' Eadem nocte reue-
latum Andreae ex apostolis ut recognos-
centibus cunctis Iohannes suo nomine
cuncta describeret ; et ideo licet uaria sin-
gulis euangeliorum libris principia
doceantur, nihil tam differt creden-
tium fidei, cum uno ac principali spiritu de-
clarata sint in omnibus omnia de natiui-
tate, de passione, de resurrectione,
de conuersatione cum discipulis suis,
ac de gemino eius aduentu.

[1] First published by L. A. Muratori in 1740 (*Antiq. Ital. Medii Aevi*, tom. iii. pp. 851-54) from a very corrupt Bobbio MS. of the end of the seventh or the beginning of the eighth century, now in the Ambrosian Library at Milan (I, 101 *sup.*). The document has often been reprinted, perhaps most recently by Rev. E. S. Buchanan in *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. viii. (1906-7), pp. 540 ff.

Primo in humilitate despectus quod fuit secundum potestatem regalis patris, praeclarum quod futurum est. Quid ergo mirum si Iohannes tam constanter singula etiam in epistulis suis proferat? dicens in semet ipso ' Quae uidimus oculis nostris et auribus audiuimus et manus nostrae palpauerunt, haec scripsimus uobis.' [1] Sic enim non solum uisorem sed auditorem se et scriptorem omnium mirabilium domini per ordinem profitetur. Acta autem omnium apostolorum sub uno libro scribta sunt. Lucas ' optimo Theofilo ' [2] conprendit quae sub praesentia eius singula gerebantur, sicuti et semota passione Petri euidenter declarat, et profectione Pauli ab Vrbe ad Hispaniam proficiscentis. Epistulae autem Pauli, quae a quo loco uel qua ex causa directae sint uolentibus intellegere ipsae declarant. Primum omnium Corinthiis scisma heresis interdicens, deinceps Galatis circumcisionem, Romanis autem ordinem scripturarum sed principium earum esse Christum intimans prolixius scripsit, de quibus singulis non necesse est a nobis disputari. Cum ipse beatus apostolus Paulus, sequens prodecessoris sui Iohannis ordinem non nisi nominatim septem ecclesiis scribat, ordine tali: ad Corinthios prima, ad Efesios secunda, ad Philippenses tertia, ad Colosenses quarta, ad Galatas quinta, ad Tessalonicenses sexta, ad Romanos septima;—uerum Corinthiis et Tessalonicensibus, licet pro correptione, iteratur—, una tamen per omnem orbem terrae ecclesia diffusa esse dinoscitur. Et Iohannes enim in Apocalypsi, licet septem ecclesiis scribat, tamen omnibus dicit. Uerum ad Filemonem una et ad Titum una et ad Timotheum duae pro affectu et dilectione, in honorem tamen ecclesiae catholicae in ordinationem ecclesiasticae disciplinae sanctificatae sunt. Fertur etiam ad

[1] 1 John i. 1. [2] Luke i. 3.

Laudicenses, alia ad Alexandrinos Pauli nomine finctae ad heresem Marcionis, et alia plura quae in catholica ecclesia recipi non potest: fel enim cum melle misceri non congruit. Epistola sane Iudae et suprascripti Iohannis duae in catholica habentur et Sapientia ab amicis Salomonis in honorem ipsius scripta. Apocalypsin etiam Iohannis et Petri tantum recipimus, quam quidam ex nostris legi in ecclesia nolunt. Pastorem uero nuperrime temporibus nostris in urbe Roma Herma conscripsit, sedente cathedram urbis Romae ecclesiae Pio episcopo fratre eius, et ideo legi eum quidem oportet, se publicare uero in ecclesia populo neque inter prophetas conpleto numero, neque inter apostolos in fine temporum potest. Arsinoi autem seu Valentini uel Miltiadis nihil in totum recipimus, qui etiam nouum Psalmorum librum Marcioni conscripserunt una cum Basilide et Asiano Catafrygum constitutore.

Notes on the Text

These notes do not take account of every variation from the MS. Trifling errors are silently corrected, but every alteration of importance is recorded.

4. *adiutorem* is a suggestion of E. S. Buchanan: the MS. has *ut iuris*.

33. *se*: MS. *sed*.

37. *semota passione*: MS. *semote passionem*.

38. *et profectione*: MS. *sed profectionem*.

42. *scisma*: MS. *scysme*. I take *heresis* as a sort of constituent genitive after *scisma*.

46. *non*: om. MS.

48. *prodecessoris*: MS. *prodecessuris*. There is nothing wrong with the word *prodecessor* (=*prodĕ-cessor* perhaps, rather than *pro-dēcessor*), which is cited twice from Symmachus (saec. iv.), and occurs also at least four times in Augustine (saec. v.). The works of these authors are preserved in good MSS. The earliest dated instance is in a Roman imperial rescript of date between 307 and 314 A.D.

54-55. I am very doubtful about the correctness of the reading and the punctuation here.

62. cf. prol. to 1 Tim. on p. 207.
68. *suprascripti* (referring to line 49): MS. *superscriclio.*
69. *catholica* (=*catholica ecclesia*): cf. O. Rottmanner in the *Revue Bénédictine*, t. xvii. (1900), pp. 1-9, reprinted in *Geistesfrüchte aus der Klosterzelle* (München, 1908), pp. 74-84; *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, vol. iii. p. 617, vv. 30-62.
75. *cathedram*: MS. *cathetra.* For *sedere* with the accusative, cf. *cathedram pestilentiae sedere*, Ps.-Aug. *Quaest. vet. et nov. Test.* cx. 5 (p. 272, 4, ed. Souter).
77. *oportet, se*: the text seems doubtful here.
79. *conpleto numero* ('seeing that their number is complete [3 large, 12 small]'): MS. *conpletum numero.*
81. *Miltiadis*: MS. *metiades.*
82. *in totum*=*omnino*, as often in the later Latin.
84. *et*: om. MS. The founder of the *Catafrygas* or Montanists was Montanus, not Basilides.

C

CANON OF UNKNOWN DATE AND PROVENANCE IN THE 'CODEX CLAROMONTANUS' WRITTEN IN THE SIXTH CENTURY (PERHAPS IN SARDINIA)

[An Old Testament list is followed by]—

Euangelia IIII.

Mattheum uer. IIDC. (*i.e.* 2600 lines).
Iohannes uer. $\overline{\text{II}}$. (*i.e.* 2000 lines).
Marcus uer. $\overline{\text{I}}$DC. (*i.e.* 1600 lines).
Lucam uer. $\overline{\text{II}}$DCCCC. (*i.e.* 2900 lines).

Epistulas Pauli:

Ad Romanos uer. $\overline{\text{I}}$XL. (*i.e.* 1040 lines).
Ad Corinthios I. uer. $\overline{\text{I}}$LX. (*i.e.* 1060 lines).
Ad Corinthios II. uer. LXX. (*sic*).
Ad Galatas uer CCCL.
Ad Efesios uer. CCCLXXV.[1]
Ad Timotheum I. uer. CCVIIII. (*sic*).
Ad Timotheum II. uer. CCLXXXVIIII.
Ad Titum uer. CXL.
Ad Colosenses uer. CCLI.
Ad Filemonem uer. L.

[1] There can be little doubt that Phil., 1 Thess., 2 Thess. should be inserted here. The faults in the numbers of lines show that the scribe was careless.

Ad Petrum prima CC.
Ad Petrum II. uer. CXL.
Iacobi uer. CCXX.
Pr[ima] Iohannis epist. CCXX.
Iohannis epistula II. XX.
Iohannis epistula III. XX.
Iudae epistula uer. LX.
—[1] Barnabae Epist. uer. DCCCL.
Iohannis Reuelatio [2] $\overline{\text{I}}$CC. (*i.e.* 1200 lines).
Actus Apostolorum $\overline{\text{II}}$DC. (*i.e.* 2600 lines).
— Pastoris uersi $\overline{\text{IIII}}$. (=4000 lines).
— Actus Pauli uer. $\overline{\text{III}}$DLX (=3560 lines).
— Reuelatio Petri CCLXX.

[*Note.*—Harnack is of opinion that this catalogue belongs in its original Greek form to Egypt and to a date about 300 (*Chronologie der altchristlichen Literatur*, Bd. ii. pp. 84 ff.): Leipoldt, *Geschichte*, u.s.w., i. p. 78, approves.]

D

AN AFRICAN CANON OF DATE ABOUT 360 A.D. (SOMETIMES CALLED THE CHELTENHAM OR MOMMSENIAN CANON [3])

[An Old Testament list is followed by]—

Item indiculum Noui Testamenti :—
Euangelia IIII. Mattheum $\overline{\text{ur}}$ $\overline{\text{II}}$DCC (=2700 lines).
Marcum $\overline{\text{uer}}$ MDCC.
Iohannem $\overline{\text{ur}}$ MDCCC.
Lucam $\overline{\text{ur}}$ $\overline{\text{III}}$CCC. (=3300 lines).
Fiunt omnes uersus $\overline{\text{X}}$ (=10,000 lines).
Epistulae Pauli $\overline{\text{n}}$ (*i.e.* numero) XIII.
Actus Apostolorum $\overline{\text{uer}}$ $\overline{\text{III}}$DC. (=3600 lines).
Apocalypsis $\overline{\text{uer}}$ MDCCC.

[1] The horizontal line represents that the scribe regarded the four works thus indicated as not on the same plane as the others.

[2] The Latin rendering of Apocalypsis is not common ; but cf. Ps.-Aug. *Quaest. vet. et nov. test. CXXVII.*, 76, 2 (*bis*) ; 122, 5 ; Isid. *Etymol.*, vi. 2, 49.

[3] Found by Theodor Mommsen in a MS. (12266, saec. x.) in the Phillipps Library at Cheltenham in 1885. Another copy has turned up at St. Gall (133. saec. ix.).

Epistulae Iohannis III. ūr CCCL.
una sola.[1]
Epistulae Petri II. ūēr CCC.
una sola.[1]

Quoniam indiculum uersuum in urbe Roma non ad liquidum, sed et alibi auaritiae causa non habent integrum, per singulos libros conputatis syllabis—posui numero XVI. uersum Vergilianum—omnibus libris numerum adscribsi.

[*Note.*—The length of ancient prose works was measured, the standard of a *versus* (or line) being the fifteen or sixteen syllables usual in the Virgilian hexameter (perhaps we ought to read *uersum* (gen. pl.) *Uergilianorum* above). A work was said to consist of so many of these lines, and this was the basis of the payment of scribes, the rate being so much a line. Roman booksellers had been guilty of fraud in the matter of the measurement of such works. The science of the measurement of books is called Stichometry.]

E

EXTRACT FROM FESTAL LETTER XXXIX. OF ATHANASIUS (367 A.D.)

1. Ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ περὶ μὲν τῶν αἱρετικῶν ἐμνήσθημεν ὡς νεκρῶν, περὶ ἡμῶν δὲ ὡς ἐχόντων πρὸς σωτηρίαν τὰς θείας γραφὰς καὶ 'φοβοῦμαι μή πως,' ὡς ἔγραψεν Κορινθίοις Παῦλος, ὀλίγοι τῶν ἀκεραίων 'ἀπὸ τῆς ἁπλότητος καὶ τῆς ἁγνότητος'[2] πλανηθῶσιν ὑπὸ 'τῆς πανουργίας' τινων ἀνθρώπων καὶ λοιπὸν ἐντυγχάνειν ἑτέροις ἄρξωνται, τοῖς λεγομένοις ἀποκρύφοις, ἀπατώμενοι τῇ ὁμωνυμίᾳ τῶν ἀληθινῶν βιβλίων, παρακαλῶ· 'ἀνέχεσθε,'[3] εἰ περὶ ὧν ἐπίστασθε, περὶ τούτων κἀγὼ μνημονεύων γράφω διὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνάγκην καὶ τὸ χρήσιμον τῆς ἐκκλησίας. 2. Μέλλων δὲ τούτων μνημονεύειν χρήσομαι πρὸς σύστασιν τῆς ἐμαυτοῦ τόλμης τῷ τύπῳ τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ Λουκᾶ, λέγων καὶ αὐτός· 'ἐπειδήπερ' τινες 'ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι'[4] ἑαυτοῖς τὰ λεγόμενα ἀπόκρυφα καὶ ἐπιμῖξαι ταῦτα τῇ 'θεοπνεύστῳ γραφῇ,'[5] 'περὶ' ἧς 'ἐπληροφορήθημεν καθὼς παρέδοσαν' τοῖς πατράσιν 'οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου, ἔδοξεν κἀμοὶ' προτραπέντι παρὰ γνησίων ἀδελφῶν καὶ μαθόντι

[1] Expresses a preference for First John and First Peter exclusively.
[2] 2 Cor. xi. 3. This *testimonium* ought to be added to my critical *apparatus.*
[3] 2 Cor. xi. 1, 4. [4] Luke i. 1. [5] Cf. 2 Tim. iii. 16.

'ἄνωθεν, ἑξῆς' ἐκθέσθαι τὰ κανονιζόμενα καὶ παραδοθέντα πιστευθέντα τε θεῖα εἶναι βιβλία, 'ἵνα' ἕκαστος, εἰ μὲν ἠπατήθη, κατα'γνῷ'[1] τῶν πλανησάντων, ὁ δὲ καθαρὸς διαμείνας χαίρῃ πάλιν ὑπομιμνησκόμενος.

3. Ἔστιν τοίνυν τῆς μὲν παλαιᾶς διαθήκης βιβλία . . .

7. Τὰ δὲ τῆς καινῆς πάλιν οὐκ ὀκνητέον εἰπεῖν. ἔστιν δὲ ταῦτα· Εὐαγγέλια τέσσαρα, κατὰ Ματθαῖον, κατὰ Μᾶρκον, κατὰ Λουκᾶν, κατὰ Ἰωάννην. 8. Εἶτα μετὰ ταῦτα Πράξεις Ἀποστόλων καὶ Ἐπιστολαὶ 'Καθολικαὶ' καλούμεναι τῶν ἀποστόλων ἑπτὰ οὕτως· Ἰακώβου μὲν μία, Πέτρου δὲ δύο, εἶτα Ἰωάννου τρεῖς, καὶ μετὰ ταύτας Ἰούδα μία. 9. Πρὸς τούτοις Παύλου ἀποστόλου εἰσὶν Ἐπιστολαὶ δεκατέσσαρες, τῇ τάξει γραφόμεναι οὕτως· πρώτη Πρὸς Ῥωμαίους, εἶτα Πρὸς Κορινθίους δύο, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα Πρὸς Γαλάτας μία, Πρὸς Ἐφεσίους μία, Πρὸς Φιλιππησίους μία, Πρὸς Κολοσσαεῖς μία, καὶ μετὰ ταύτας Πρὸς Θεσσαλονικέας δύο καὶ ἡ Πρὸς Ἑβραίους· καὶ εὐθὺς Πρὸς μὲν Τιμόθεον δύο, Πρὸς δὲ Τίτον μία, καὶ τελευταία ἡ Πρὸς Φιλήμονα μία· καὶ πάλιν Ἰωάννου Ἀποκάλυψις.[2]

10. Ταῦτα πηγαὶ σωτηρίου, ὥστε τὸν διψῶντα ἐμφορεῖσθαι τῶν ἐν τούτοις λογίων· ἐν τούτοις μόνοις τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας διδασκαλεῖον εὐαγγελίζεται· μηδεὶς τούτοις ἐπιβαλλέτω, μηδὲ τούτων ἀφαιρείσθω τι·[3] περὶ δὲ τούτων ὁ κύριος Σαδδουκαίους μὲν ἐδυσώπει λέγων· 'Πλανᾶσθε μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφάς,'[4] τοὺς δὲ Ἰουδαίους παρῄνει· ''Ερευνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς, ὅτι' αὐταί 'εἰσιν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ.'[5] 11. Ἀλλ' ἕνεκά γε πλείονος ἀκριβείας προστίθημι καὶ τοῦτο, γράφων ἀναγκαίως, ὡς ὅτι ἐστιν καὶ ἕτερα βιβλία τούτων ἔξωθεν, οὐ κανονιζόμενα μέν, τετυπωμένα δὲ παρὰ τῶν πατέρων ἀναγινώσκεσθαι τοῖς ἄρτι προσερχομένοις κατηχεῖσθαι τὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας λόγον.[6] Σοφία Σολομῶντος καὶ Σοφία Σιρὰχ καὶ Ἐσθὴρ καὶ Ἰουδὶθ καὶ Τωβίας καὶ Διδαχὴ καλουμένη Τῶν Ἀποστόλων καὶ ὁ Ποιμήν. 12. Καὶ ὅμως, ἀγαπητοί, κἀκείνων κανονιζομένων καὶ τούτων ἀναγινωσκομένων, οὐδαμοῦ τῶν ἀποκρύφων μνήμη, ἀλλὰ αἱρετικῶν ἐστιν ἐπίνοια, γραφόντων μὲν ὅτε θέλουσιν αὐτά, χαριζομένων δὲ καὶ προστιθέντων αὐτοῖς χρόνους, ἵνα ὡς παλαιὰ προφέροντες πρόφασιν ἔχωσιν ἀπατᾶν ἐκ τούτου τοὺς ἀκεραίους. [End of the Greek] . . .

[1] Cf. Luke i. 1-4.

[2] Athanasius' list is identical with that of the Council of Laodicea of four years before, except that there the Apocalypse is absent (see Westcott's *General Survey of the History of the Canon* (London, 1875), p. 533). Gregory of Nazianzus' († 389 or 390) list agrees exactly with that of the Council.

[3] Cf. Apoc. xxii. 18, 19.

[4] Matt. xxii. 29.

[5] John v. 39.

[6] Cf. Luke i. 4.

[The above text is borrowed from Zahn, *op. cit.*, pp. 86 ff., with slight alterations. From his German also I translate the Coptic fragments which follow on the above.]

Translation

1. But since I have spoken of the heretics as dead, while with regard to ourselves as possessors of the divine writings unto salvation, I am actually afraid lest in any way, as Paul said in writing to the Corinthians, a few of the undefiled may be led astray from the simplicity and the purity by the villainy of certain men, and thereafter begin to consort with others, the so-called secret (books), being deceived by their possession of the same names as the genuine books, I give you exhortation: bear with me if I actually make mention of writings you know, and if I write (about them) on account of the (present) stress and the advantage of the Church. 2. Seeing I am to mention these matters, I will follow, to back up my venturesomeness, the example of the evangelist Luke, and I also will say: Since certain men have attempted to arrange for themselves the so-called secret writings and to mingle them with the God-inspired Scripture, concerning which we have been fully informed, even as was handed down to our fathers by those who were eye-witnesses and servants of the word from the beginning, I also resolved, being encouraged by true brethren and learning (all) from the beginning, to set forth in order the writings that are in the list and handed down and believed to be divine, in order that each person, if he has been deceived, may condemn those who led him astray, and that he who has remained stainless may rejoice, being again reminded (of the truth).

3. There are then of the Old Testament books . . .

7. Those of the New Testament I must not shrink from mentioning in their turn. They are these: Four Gospels, According to Matthew, According to Mark, According to Luke, According to John. 8. Then after these are Acts of Apostles and Letters of the Apostles called 'Catholic,' seven of them, as follows:—Of James one, of Peter two, then of John three, and after these one of Jude. 9. In addition, there are fourteen Letters of Paul the apostle, written thus in their order: the first to the Romans, then two to the Corinthians, and thereafter one to Galatians, to Ephesians one, to Philippians one, to Colossians one, and after these to Thessalonians two and that to Hebrews; and, without a break, to Timothy two, to Titus one, and lastly that to Philemon, one; and of John again the Revelation.

10. These are springs of salvation, so that he that is thirsty can fill himself with the (divine) responses in them; in these alone is the good news of the teaching of true religion proclaimed; let no one add to them or take away aught of them. It was in regard to

these that the Lord was ashamed of the Sadducees, saying:—'Ye are being led astray, as ye know not the scriptures,' and exhorted the Jews: 'Search the scriptures, for they are the very writings that witness concerning me.' 11. But for the sake of more exactness of detail, I add also this, writing of necessity, that there are also other books apart from these, not indeed in the list, but produced by our ancestors to be read by those who are just coming forward to receive oral instruction in the word of true religion: The Wisdom of Solomon, and the Wisdom of Sirach and Esther and Judith and Tobit, and the so-called Teaching of the Apostles and The Shepherd. 12. And nevertheless, beloved, though the former writings be in the list and the latter are read, there is nowhere mention of the secret writings, but they are a device of heretics, who write them when they will, furnishing them with dates and adding them, that bringing them forth as ancient they may thus have an excuse for deceiving the undefiled.

. . . . . .

13.[1] But great is the hardness of heart of those who do this and are not afraid of the word which is written: 'Ye shall not add to the word that I command you, nor take away from it.'[2] Who has made the simple-minded believe that those books are those of Enoch, seeing that there are no writings earlier than Moses? How is it that they say: 'Isaiah has secret books'? He, who openly preaches on the high mountain and who says: 'I have not spoken in obscure language nor in a place of dark country.'[3] How has Moses secret books? He, who composed Deuteronomy, while calling heaven and earth to witness.[4] 14. But this leads to nothing else but the itching of the ears,[5] and the means of piety,[6] and the desire to please women.[7] But Paul formerly wrote to his pupil about such men: 'A time will come, when people will not endure the healthy teaching, but will raise up for themselves teachers according to their own lusts, since their ears itch, and they turn away their ears from the truth and turn to fables.'[8] For, in truth, the Apocrypha are fables, and attention directed to them is vain, because they are vain and abominable voices. For this means beginnings of dissensions and a like goal is quarrelling among men, who do not care about the Church's advantage, but long to receive honour from those whom they have deceived, that people may think of them that they are great, because they make known new things (words). So it is fitting that we reject such books; for, even if we find a useful word in them, yet it is good not to believe them. For that comes from the cunning of those . . .

[1] Apologies are due to the shade of Athanasius for this part, which is a translation of a translation of a translation.

[2] Cf. Apoc. xxii. 18, 19. [3] Isaiah xlv. 19. [4] Deut. i.?

[5] Cf. 2 Tim. iv. 3. [6] Cf. 1 Tim. vi. 5-6.

[7] Cf. 2 Tim. iii. 6. [8] 2 Tim. iv. 3, 4.

15. . . . in the scriptures. I have contented myself with these, that you may keep them in mind, in order that, since you possess the holy patterns and admirably put in practice the words of the holy scriptures, you may one day hear (the words):—'Hail, thou good and faithful servant, as thou wert faithful over a little, I will set thee over much.'[1] I have not really written this as if to instruct, for I have not attained to such importance, but, when I heard that the heretics, or rather the miserable Meletians,[2] boast of the so-called Apocrypha, for that reason I have made known to you all that I heard from my father, seeing I am as it were with you and you with me 'in' *one* 'house, which is the community of the living God, pillars and shafts of the truth.'[3] This allows us, by our coming to *one* place, to purify ourselves from all defilement, from doubt and dispute and haughtiness of children, and lets us content ourselves with the scripture inspired by God, that it teaches us, whose books we have indicated with the above words, which they are and how many in number, etc.

F

ORDER OF THE EPISTLES OF PAUL IN THE COMMENTARY OF 'AMBROSIASTER' (ABOUT 380 IN ROME)

Ad Romanos.
Ad Corinthios I.
Ad Corinthios II.
Ad Galatas.
Ad Ephesios.
Ad Philippenses.
Ad Thessalonicenses I.
Ad Thessalonicenses II.
Ad Colossenses.
Ad Titum.
Ad Timotheum I.
Ad Timotheum II.
Ad Philemonem.[4]

[*Note.*—The placing of the Epistles to the Thessalonians before that to Colossians is no doubt due to a desire to group the Mace-

[1] Matt. xxv. 21, 23.
[2] This sect was constituted at Antioch in 361 by Melitius, who had recently been made Bishop of that diocese.
[3] 1 Tim. iii. 15.
[4] Souter, *Study of Ambrosiaster* (Cambridge, 1905), p. 197; Ambrosiaster (*loc. cit.*) also advocates the order for the Gospels: Matthew, Luke, Mark, John, but whether as merely ideal is uncertain.

donian epistles together. This order is found also in Priscillian (cf. the introduction to Schepss' edition, page xli.), the Roman Canon of 400 (Document N), Augustine (Document L and *Epist. ad Cath.* xii. 31, *Speculum*, etc.), Pelagius [and his dependants Pseudo-Jerome, Cassiodorus and Co., Sedulius Scottus], Gildas (*Zeitschrift für celt. Philol.* iv. (1902-3), p. 528), Cassiodorus, *Complexiones*, Isidore, and a large number of good Vulgate MSS. (cf. Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate* [Paris, 1893], p. 341). Victorinus († 303) *in Apoc.* has also matter bearing on this question, but we must await the publication of Haussleiter's edition. Titus followed Colossians also in Cyprian's copy (Turner in *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. vi. [1904-5], p. 262).][1]

G

[COUNCIL UNDER DAMASUS (382 AT ROME)]

[The publication of Professor Ernst von Dobschütz's *Das Decretum Gelasianum de Libris Recipiendis et Non Recipiendis* (Leipzig, 1912), on the eve of the appearance of the present work, has shown that the so-called Damasine decree, which I had printed at this point, is unauthentic, and is really an extract from the so-called *Decretum Gelasianum*, a production of the sixth century. See Document S.]

H

FILASTER, BISHOP OF BRESCIA, *DIUERSARUM HERESEON LIBER* (383, OR SOON AFTER)

32 (60) Alii post hos sunt heretici qui Euangelium Cata Iohannen et Apocalypsin ipsius non accipiunt, et cum non intellegunt uirtutem scripturae nec desiderant discere, in heresi permanent pereuntes, ut etiam Cerinthi illius heretici esse audeant dicere ⟨et Euangelium Cata Iohannen⟩[2] et Apocalypsin ipsius itidem non beati Iohannis euangelistae et apostoli, sed Cerinthi heretici . . .

60 (88) Alia est heresis, quae Apocryfa, id est secreta ⟨ten⟩et solum profetarum et apostolorum, ⟨neque⟩ accipit scripturas canonicas, id est legem et profetas, uetus et nouum scilicet testamentum. (2) Et cum uolunt solum illa apocrifa legere, studiose contraria scripturis canonicis sentiunt, atque paulatim dogmatizant, contra

[1] The hurriedly written note in *Study of Ambrosiaster*, p. xii., is inexact, and is hereby and below, Document P, corrected.

[2] The angular brackets, according to convention, enclose matter not present in the MSS., but required by the sense.

eas dantes sententias, contra legem et profetas contraque dispositiones beatissimorum apostolorum consulta ponentes: (3) e quibus sunt maxime Manichei, Gnostici, Nicolaitae, Valentiniani, et alii quam plurimi, qui apocrifa profetarum et apostolorum, id est Actus separatos habentes, canonicas legere scripturas contemnunt. (4) Propter quod statutum est ab apostolis beatis et eorum successoribus non aliud legi in ecclesia debere catholica nisi legem et profetas et Euangelia et Actus Apostolorum et Pauli tredecim [1] Epistulas, et septem alias, Petri [2] duas, Iohannis tres, Iudae unam, et unam Iacobi, quae septem Actibus Apostolorum coniunctae sunt. (5) Scripturae autem absconditae, id est apocryfa,[3] etsi legi debent morum causa a perfectis, non ab omnibus debent, quia non intellegentes multa addiderunt et tulerunt quae uoluerunt heretici. (6) Nam Manichei apocryfa beati Andreae apostoli, id est Actus quos fecit ueniens de Ponto in Greciam, ⟨accipiunt⟩, quos conscripserunt tunc discipuli sequentes beatum apostolum, unde et habent Manichei et alii tales Andreae beati et Iohannis Actus euangelistae beati et Petri similiter beatissimi [2] apostoli, et Pauli pariter beati apostoli: (7) in quibus quia signa fecerunt magna et prodigia, ut et pecudes et canes et bestiae loquerentur, etiam et animas hominum tales uelut canum et pecudum similes inputauerunt esse heretici perditi.

61 (89) Sunt alii qui epistulam beati Pauli ad Hebreos non adserunt esse ipsius, sed dicunt aut Barnabae esse beati apostoli aut Clementis de urbe Roma episcopi, (2) alii autem Lucae beatissimi euangelistae aiunt: epistulam etiam ad Laudicenses scriptam beati apostoli quidam uolunt legere. Et quia addiderunt in ea quaedam non bene sentientes, inde non legitur in Ecclesia, et, si legitur a quibusdam, non tamen in Ecclesia legitur populo nisi tredecim epistulae ipsius, et ad Hebreos interdum. (3) Et in ea quia rhetorice scripsit, sermone plausibili, inde non putant esse eiusdem apostoli; et quia et 'factum' [4] Christum dicit in ea, inde non legitur: de paenitentia autem propter Nouatianos aeque. . . .

[1] Note the absence of Hebrews.

[2] Note the Roman influence in these two places: Peter's epistles come first, and he is *beatissimus*, while the others are only *beati*.

[3] Note *absconditus* as the rendering of *ἀπόκρυφος*.

[4] Hebr. iii. 2.

I

ST. JEROME'S LETTER (LIII.) TO PAULINUS, A PRESBYTER (394 ?)

. . . § 9 Cernis me scripturarum amore raptum excessisse modum epistulae, et tamen non inplesse quod volui. . . . Tangam et Nouum breuiter Testamentum : Mattheus, Marcus, Lucas, Iohannes, quadriga domini et uerum cherubin, quod interpretatur 'scientiae multitudo,' per totum corpus oculati sunt, scintillae micant, discurrunt fulgura, pedes habent rectos et in sublime tendentes, terga pennata et ubique uolitantia. tenent se mutuo sibique perplexi sunt et quasi rota in rota uoluuntur et pergunt, quocumque eos flatus sancti spiritus duxerit. Paulus apostolus ad septem scribit ecclesias—octaua enim ad Hebraeos a plerisque [*very many*][1] extra numerum ponitur —Timotheum instruit ac Titum, Philemonem pro fugitiuo famulo deprecatur. super quo tacere melius puto quam pauca dicere. Actus Apostolorum nudam quidem sonare uidentur historiam et nascentis ecclesiae infantiam texere, sed, si nouerimus scriptorem eorum Lucam esse medicum, 'cuius laus est in euangelio,'[2] animaduertemus pariter omnia uerba illius languentis animae esse medicamina. Iacobus, Petrus, Iohannes, Iudas septem epistulas ediderunt tam mysticas quam succinctas et breues pariter ac longas : breues in uerbis, longas in sententiis, ut rarus non in earum lectione caecuttiat. Apocalypsis Iohannis tot habet sacramenta quot uerba. parum dixi, et pro merito uoluminis laus omnis inferior est ; in uerbis singulis multiplices latent intellegentiae.

K

SYNOD OF CARTHAGE (397)

Can. 39. Item placuit ut praeter scripturas canonicas nihil in ecclesia legatur sub nomine diuinarum scripturarum. Sunt autem canonicae scripturae hae :—[*then follows a list of Old Testament books*]. Noui autem Testamenti :—

Euangeliorum libri quattuor.

Actuum Apostolorum liber unus.

[1] We cannot insist on the Ciceronian usage of *plerique* in a writer as late as Jerome.

[2] 2 Cor. viii. 18.

Epistulae Pauli Apostoli xiii.
eiusdem ad Hebreos una.
Petri apostoli duae.
Iohannis tres.
Iacobi i.
Iudae i.
Apocalypsis Iohannis liber unus.

[De confirmando isto canone transmarina ecclesia consulatur.]

Hoc etiam fratri et consacerdoti nostro Bonifatio, uel aliis earum partium episcopis, pro confirmando isto canone innotescat, quia a patribus ista accepimus in Ecclesia legenda. Liceat autem legi passiones martyrum, cum anniuersarii eorum dies celebrantur.[1]

L

ST. AUGUSTINE, *DE DOCTRINA CHRISTIANA* (397, OR LATER), II. cc. 8-9, §§ 12-14 (ed. Bened. tom. iii. pars. i. [Paris, 1680] pp. 23, 24).

Erit igitur diuinarum scripturarum sollertissimus indagator, qui primo totas legerit notasque habuerit, et si nondum intellectu, iam tamen lectione dumtaxat,[2] eas quae appellantur canonicae. Nam ceteras securius leget fide ueritatis instructus, ne praeoccupent inbecillem animum et periculosis mendaciis adque fantasmatis eludentes praeiudicent aliquid contra sanam intellegentiam. In canonicis autem scripturis ecclesiarum catholicarum quam plurium auctoritatem sequatur, inter quas sane illae sint, quae apostolicas sedes habere et epistulas accipere meruerunt. Tenebit igitur hunc modum in scripturis canonicis, ut eas, quae ab omnibus accipiuntur ecclesiis catholicis, praeponat eis, quas quaedam non accipiunt; in eis uero, quae non accipiuntur ab omnibus, praeponat eas, quas plures grauioresque accipiunt, eis, quas pauciores minorisque auctoritatis ecclesiae tenent. Si autem alias inuenerit a pluribus, alias a grauioribus haberi, quamquam

[1] Augustine carried out this practice at Hippo Regius, as his surviving sermons show.

[2] Wrongly punctuated before *dumtaxat* in the editions.

hoc facile inuenire [1] non possit, aequalis tamen auctoritatis eas habendas puto. (13) Totus autem canon scripturarum, in quo istam considerationem uersandam dicimus, his libris continetur [*follows Old Testament list*] His XLIIII. libris Testamenti Veteris terminatur auctoritas: Noui autem quattuor libris Euangelii, secundum Mattheum, secundum Marcum, secundum Lucam, secundum Iohannem, quattuordecim epistulis Pauli apostoli, ad Romanos, ad Corinthios duabus, ad Galatas, ad Efesios, ad Philippenses, ad Thesalonicenses duabus, ad Colosenses, ad Timotheum duabus, ad Titum, ad Filemonem, ad Hebreos; Petri duabus; tribus Iohannis, una Iudae et una Iacobi; Actibus Apostolorum libro uno, et Apocalypsi Iohannis libro uno (c. 9). (14) In his omnibus libris timentes deum et pietate mansueti quaerunt voluntatem dei.

[*Note.*—The order 'Phil. Thess.' is confirmed by the genuine Augustinian *Speculum*, by his *Epistula ad Catholicos*, 12, 31, and possibly by other passages, but contradicted by his *Contra Partem Donati post Gesta*, 4, 4, in favour of our order.]

M

RUFINUS, PRESBYTER, OF AQUILEIA,[2] *COMM. IN SYMB. APOST.* § 36 (BETWEEN 397 AND 410)

Hic igitur spiritus sanctus est, qui in Veteri Testamento legem et prophetas, in nouo euangelia et apostolos inspirauit. Unde et apostolus dicit:—(2 Tim. iii. 16 *quoted*). Et ideo quae sunt Noui ac Veteris Testamenti volumina, quae secundum maiorum traditionem per ipsum spiritum sanctum inspirata creduntur et ecclesiis Christi tradita, conpetens uidetur hoc in loco euidenti numero, sicut ex patrum monumentis accepimus, designare.

(37) Itaque Veteris Testamenti. . . .

Noui uero quattuor Euangelia, Matthaei, Marci, Lucae, et Iohannis. Actus Apostolorum, quos describit Lucas. Pauli apostoli Epistulae quattuordecim. Petri apostoli duae. Iacobi, fratris domini et apostoli, una. Iudae una. Iohannis tres. Apocalypsis Iohannis.

[1] I think *inueniri* more likely here.

[2] One of the greatest Christian travellers of his age, thoroughly conversant with and much dependent on Greek sources.

Haec sunt, quae patres intra canonem concluserunt, et ex quibus fidei nostrae adsertiones constare uoluerunt.

(38) Sciendum tamen est quod et alii libri sunt, qui non canonici, sed ecclesiastici a maioribus appellati sunt. . . . [*Wisdom, etc.*]: in Nouo uero Testamento libellus, qui dicitur Pastoris seu Hermas, qui appellatur Duae Viae uel Iudicium Petri, quae omnia legi quidem in ecclesiis uoluerunt, non tamen proferri ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam. Ceteras uero scripturas ' apocryphas ' nominarunt, quas in ecclesiis legi noluerunt. Haec nobis a patribus tradita sunt, quae, ut dixi, oportunum uisum est hoc in loco designare ad instructionem eorum, qui prima sibi ecclesiae ac fidei elementa suscipiunt, ut sciant ex quibus sibi fontibus uerbi dei haurienda sint pocula.

N

A ROMAN CANON (OF DATE ABOUT 400)

Secundum Hieronimum ordo scripturarum nec non et uersuum quae habentur in canone Veteris Testamenti. . . .

ITEM NOVI TESTAMENTI:

Euangeliorum libri IIII.

secundum Mattheum liber habet uersus numero $\overline{\text{II}}$DXX. (*i.e.* 2520)

secundum Marcum liber habet uersus numero MDCC.

secundum Lucan liber habet uersus numero $\overline{\text{II}}$DCCCL. (*i.e.* 2850)

secundum Iohannem liber habet uersus numero $\overline{\text{II}}$CCCX. (*i.e.* 2310)

facti sunt uersus numero $\overline{\text{VIIII}}$CCCLX.(=9360)

Actus Apostolorum quos descripsit Lucas [1] euangelista: liber habet uersus numero $\overline{\text{III}}$DCCC. (*i.e.* 3800)

Epistulae apostolorum canonicae:

epistula Iacobi I. habet uersus numero CCC.

epistula Petri habet uersus numero CCC.

[1] Cf. Rufinus' phrase above.

item epistula Petri secunda
habet uersus numero CC.
epistula Iohannis prima habet
uersus numero CCLX.
eiusdem [1] secunda habet uersus
numero LV.
cuius supra III. habet uersus
numero LXVIIII.
epistula Iudae zelotis habet
uersus numero LVI.
facti sunt MCCXL.
Epistulae Pauli apostoli numero XIIII.
ad Romanos habet uersus nu-
mero DCCCL.
ad Corinthios I. habet uersus
numero DCCCXLII.
ad Corinthios II. habet uersus
numero DCCXII.
ad Galatas habet uersus numero CCCXII.
ad Ephesios habet uersus nu-
mero CCCCXII.
ad Philippenses habet uersus
numero CCC.
[ad Thesalonicenses I. habet
uersus numero]
ad Thesalonicenses II. habet
uersus numero CCLXXX.
ad Colosenses habet uersus nu-
mero CX.
ad Timotheum I. habet uersus
numero XCVII.
[ad Timotheum II. habet uersus
numero]
ad Filimonem habet uersus
numero XLVIIII.
ad Hebraeos habet uersus nu-
mero DCCL.
facti sunt uersus numero CXIIII.
Apocalipsis Iohannis
apostoli habet uersus numero MCCCC.

[1] Note the difference from the 'Damasine' list.

Facti sunt omnes uersus Veteris Testamenti . . item Noui Testamenti facti sunt numero XVIIIIDCCCCXIIII (*i.e.* 19,914) : ac sic omnes in unum Veteris et Noui Testamenti. . . .

. . . quattuor autem animalia secundum mysterium et spiritalem intellegentiam quattuor sunt euangelistae. Ita Mattheus in typo hominis, quia in capite libri dixit : 'Christi autem generatio sic erat,' et reliqua ; Marcus in typo leonis, quia uoce magna fremens, a Iohanne Baptista, qui erat tunc in deserto, sumpsit exordium ; Lucas in typo uituli, quia praemissa breuiter praefatione ad Theofilum a sacerdotio et hostia coepit ; Iohannes in typo aquilae mox mystice ad caelestia conuolauit, quippe qui in pectus domini, ut mysterium agnosceret, recubuerat, et uere Boanerges (quod est interpretatum 'tonitrui filius') exclamauit : 'In Principio, etc.'

[*Notes.*—It has been conjectured by Mr. C. H. Turner,[1] whose text, from a Freising MS. now at Munich (Clm. 6243, saec. viii. med.), is, with slight alterations, borrowed above, that this canon may be a translation of a Greek one in the library of Pamphilus at Caesarea. It has certain analogies with the 'Gelasian' List (Document S) : the epithet 'canonical' applied to the Catholic Epistles, and title 'Zelotes' added to the name of Jude. But in certain respects it differs from the 'Gelasian' list. It will be noted, further, that our MS. is defective in omitting one of the Thessalonian and one of the Timothean Epistles. Also, the numbers are not infrequently obviously at fault. Errors in numbers are of all the most frequent in ancient MSS. The symbolism at the end goes back to Irenaeus (from the Apocalypse, iv. 7), iii. 11, 8, and is found also in the prologue to Pseudo-Jerome on the Four Gospels.]

O

I

DOCTRINE OF ADDAI (SYRIAC) (Second Half of Fourth Century)[2]

'The Law and the Prophets and the Gospel . . . and the Epistles of Paul . . . and the Acts of the twelve

[1] *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. ii. (1900-1), pp. 236-53.
[2] See Burkitt, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshê*, ii. p. 162.

Apostles . . . these books read ye in the Church of God, and with these read not others.'

II

A SYRIAC CANON OF DATE ABOUT 400[1]

. . . . . .

Gospel of Matthew, 2522 lines.
Gospel of Mark, 1675 lines.
Gospel of Luke, 3083 lines.
Gospel of John, 1737 lines.
The whole Gospel, 9218 lines.
The Action[2] of the Apostles, 2720 lines.
Of the Apostle Paul, Letter of the Galatians, 265 lines.
Of the Corinthians, the First 946 lines.
Of the Corinthians, the Second 653 lines.
Of the Romans, 825 lines.
Of the Hebrews, 837 lines.
Of the Colossians, 275 lines.
Of the Ephesians, 318 lines.
[Of the Philippians, 318 lines].[3]
Of the Philippians, 235 lines.
Of the Thessalonians, the First 417 lines.
Of the Thessalonians, the Second 118 lines.
〈Of Timothy, the First 〉.[4]
Of Timothy, the Second 114 lines.
Of Titus, 116 lines.
Of Philemon, 53 lines.
The entire Apostle, 5076 lines.

. . . . . .

[*Note.*—This Canon is the most perfect possible confirmation of the statement of the *Doctrine of Addai*. Also neither in Aphraates nor in the genuine works of St. Ephraim, both fourth-century Syriac authors, is there any reference to any Catholic Epistle.][5]

[1] First edited in *Studia Sinaitica*, i., by Mrs. Lewis (London, 1894), pp. 11-14, after a ninth-century MS. in the Convent of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai; cf. Zahn's *Grundriss*, p. 86.

[2] The Assyrians regularly take πράξις as πρᾶξις (singular).

[3] This line is an obvious case of dittography and παραβλεψία.

[4] This line is accidentally omitted.

[5] See Burkitt, *loc. cit.* I have verified the statement for Aphraates myself.

III

THE PESHITTA (VULGATE) SYRIAC REVISION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT (BETWEEN 411-35 A.D.)

Contained the following books only :—

The Four Gospels, Acts, the Epistle of James, the First Epistle of Peter, the First Epistle of John, fourteen Epistles of Paul.[1]

P

LETTER OF POPE INNOCENT[2] TO EXSUPERIUS OF TOULOUSE (405 A.D.)

Qui uero libri recipiantur in canone, breuis[3] adnexus ostendit. Haec sunt quae desiderata moneri uoce uoluisti :

[*After Old Testament books.*]

Item Noui Testamenti :
Euangeliorum IIII.
Apostoli Pauli Epistulae XIII.[4]
Epistulae Iohannis III.
Epistulae Petri II.
Epistula Iudae.
Epistula Iacobi.
Actus Apostolorum.
Apocalypsis Iohannis.

cetera autem, quae uel sub nomine Mathiae siue Iacobi Minoris, vel sub nomine Petri et Iohannis, quae a quodam Leucio scripta sunt, uel sub nomine Andreae, quae a Xenocaride et Leonida philosophis, uel sub nomine Thomae, et siqua sunt alia, non solum repudianda, uerum etiam noueris esse damnanda.

[1] The catalogue given by Ebedjésu bar Bérika, metropolitan of Nisibis, is identical with this, except that at the end occurs the Diatessaron of Tatian (cf. Jacquier, *Le Nouveau Testament dans l'Église Chrétienne*, tom. i. (Paris, 1911), p. 437).

[2] After C. H. Turner's text in *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. xiii. (1911-12), pp. 77-82.

[3] *Breuis* is here a noun='epitome,' and in this sense it makes diminutives *breuiarius, breuiculus.*

[4] Three MSS. (including the best) give xiii., others xiiii.

Q

ORDER OF THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL IN THE COMMENTARY OF PELAGIUS (409-10 A.D. AT ROME)

Ad Romanos.
Ad Corinthios I.
Ad Corinthios II.
Ad Galatas.
Ad Efesios.
Ad Philippenses.
Ad Thessalonicenses I.
Ad Thessalonicenses II.
Ad Colossenses.
Ad Timotheum I.
Ad Timotheum II.
Ad Titum.
Ad Philemonem.

[*Note.*—This is the order we have already found in other authorities: see the note on Document F. For Pelagius it is not only attested by the only known MS. of the Commentary in its original form, Karlsruhe Augiensis cxix. (saec. ix. in.), but also (*a*) by certain MSS. of the Pseudo-Jerome expansion of the Commentary; (*b*) by the Cassiodorian recension of Pelagius, wrongly published under the name of Primasius; (*c*) by the anonymous expansion of Pelagius, represented by the Veronese MS., Paris 653 (saec. ix. init.); and (*d*) by Sedulius Scottus' Commentary (saec. ix. med.), based mainly on Pelagius.[1]]

R

EUCHERIUS, BISHOP OF LYONS, *INSTRUCTIONES* (BETWEEN 424 AND 455 A.D.)

[In this work part is devoted to 'Quaestiones Difficiliores Noui Testamenti,' and the difficulties are taken book by book. There is a presumption that he is giving the books in the order in which they occur in his copy of each separate section of the Bible. The Gospels, for example, are given in the familiar order. I copy the headings of chapters.]

De Euangelio Matthei.
De Marco.

[1] These statements are fuller and more correct than those in *Study of Ambrosiaster*, p. xii.

De Luca.
De Iohanne.
De Apostolo ad Romanos.
I. Ad Corinthios.
II. Ad Corinthios.
Ad Ephesios.
Ad Thessalonicenses.
Ad Colosenses.
I. Ad Timotheum.
II. Ad Timotheum.
Ad Hebreos.
De Actibus Apostolorum.
De Epistula Iacobi.
De Epistula Iohannis.
De Apocalypsi.

[*Note.*—Not only is an adequate edition of Eucherius wanted, but a thorough investigation of his biblical quotations as well.]

S

THE SO-CALLED *DECRETUM GELASIANUM DE LIBRIS RECIPIENDIS ET NON RECIPIENDIS* (SIXTH CENTURY)

[*Note.*—This Decree, which MSS. attribute indiscriminately to Popes Damasus, Hormisdas, and Gelasius (sometimes also it is anonymous), is, according to Von Dobschütz, the work of none of these, but a sixth-century production. I should agree.]

Nunc uero de scripturis diuinis agendum est, quid uniuersalis catholica recipiat ecclesia vel quid uitare debeat.

[*After Old Testament books.*]

Item: Ordo Scripturarum Noui Testamenti, quem sancta et catholica Romana suscipit et ueneratur ecclesia.

Euangeliorum libri IIII. :—
sec. Matheum lib. I.
sec. Marcum lib. I.
sec. Lucam lib. I.
sec. Iohannem lib. I.

Item: Actuum Apostolorum lib. I.

Epistulae Pauli Apostoli num. XIIII.
ad Romanos epist. I.
ad Corinthios epist. II.
ad Ephesios epist. I.
ad Thesalonicenses epist. II.
ad Galatas epist. I.
ad Philippenses epist. I.
ad Colosenses epist. I.
ad Timotheum epist. II.
ad Titum epist. I.
ad Philemonem epist. I.
ad Hebreos epist. I.
Item: Apocalypsis Iohannis lib. I.
Item: Canonicae Epistulae numero VII.
Petri Apostoli epist. II.
Iacobi Apostoli epist. I.
Iohannis Apostoli epist. I.
Alterius Iohannis presbyteri epist. II.
Iudae Zelotis apostoli epist. I.

EXPLICIT CANON NOVI TESTAMENTI

[*Note.*—The Canon also contains regulations with regard to apocryphal books, but I do not attempt to print these. On everything connected with this decree consult the epoch-making work of E. von Dobschütz, *Das Decretum Gelasianum*, u.s.w. (Leipzig, 1912), just published.]

T

CASSIODORUS' *INSTITUTIO* (BETWEEN 551 AND 562[1])

Cap. XIII. *The Order of the Books accepted by St. Augustine* is derived from L, and harmonises with it.

Cap. XIIII. . . . scriptura sancta secundum antiquam translationem . . . [*Old Testament*]. Post haec sequuntur

Euangelia quattuor: id est—
Mathei.
Marci.

[1] I give the dates according to Lehmann in *Philologus* for 1912, p. 295; Traube, *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen*, bd. i. (München, 1909), p. 105, gives 'between 546 and 555'; others date differently: for example, Dom Chapman, *Notes on the Early History of the Vulgate Gospels* (Oxford, 1908), p. 39, decides for a date 'about 560, or even later,' and that 'the aged author added to it from time to time.'

Lucae.
Iohannis.
Actus Apostolorum.
Epistulae:
Petri ad Gentes.
Iacobi.
Iohannis ad Parthos.
Epistulae Pauli:
[1] ad Romanos I.
ad Corinthios II.
ad Galatas I.
ad Philippenses I.
ad Colossenses I.
ad Ephesios I.
ad Thessalonicenses II.
ad Timotheum II.
ad Titum.
ad Philemonem.
Apocalypsis Iohannis.

[*Note.*—Observe here the omission of Second Peter, Second and Third John, Jude and Hebrews. Seventy books of the Bible are reckoned in all, and forty-eight is the number given to the Old Testament. This leaves twenty-two for the New, exactly the number given above.]

U

IUNILIUS *INSTITUTA REGULARIA DIUINAE LEGIS*

LIB. I. (PROBABLY 551 A.D.)[2]

Cap. III. In quibus libris diuina continetur historia? . . . Euangeliorum IIII., secundum Mattheum, secundum Marcum, secundum Lucam, secundum Iohannem, Actuum Apostolorum I. . . .

[1] From this point the text is according to the Bamberg MS., H. J., iv. 15 (saec. viii.) (see P. Corssen in *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie* (1891), p. 20 of Sonderabdruck; his data I have been able to verify by Mr. C. H. Turner's kindness), which agrees exactly with the list in the *Codex Amiatinus* (saec. viii. in.) of the Latin Bible (see Professor H. J. White in *Studia Biblica*, vol. ii. (Oxford, 1890), pp. 293 f.)

[2] I borrow this from Kihn, *Theodor von Mopsuestia* (Freiburg-i.-B., 1880). Junilius was an African by birth, and *quaestor sacri palatii* at Constantinople.

Cap. IIII. In quibus libris prophetia suscipitur ? . . . Ceterum de Iohannis Apocalypsi apud orientales admodum dubitatur. . . . .

Cap. VI. Qui libri ad simplicem doctrinam pertinent ? Canonici xvii., id est Eccles. lib. I. Epist. Pauli apostoli ; ad Rom. i., ad Corinth. ii., ad Gal. i., ad Ephes. i., ad Philip. i., ad Coloss. i., ad Thessal. ii., ad Timoth. ii., ad Titum i., ad Philem. i., ad Hebr. i. : beati Petri ad gentes prima, et beati Iohannis prima. Nulli alii libri ad simplicem doctrinam pertinent ? Adiungunt quam plurimi quinque alias, quae apostolorum canonicae nuncupantur, id est Iacobi I., Petri secunda, Iudae una, Iohannis duae . . .

Cap. VII. *De Auctoritate Scripturarum.* Quo modo diuinorum librorum consideratur auctoritas ? Quia quaedam perfectae auctoritatis sunt, quaedam mediae, quaedam nullius. Quae sunt perfectae auctoritatis ? Quae canonica in singulis speciebus absolute numerauimus. Quae mediae ? Quae adiungi a pluribus diximus. Quae nullius auctoritatis sunt ? Reliqua omnia. In omnibus speciebus dictionis hae differentiae inueniuntur ? In historia et simplici doctrina omnes :[1] nam in prophetia mediae auctoritatis libri praeter Apocalypsin non repperiuntur nec in prouerbiali specie omnino cassata.[2]

[*Note.*—This canon is influenced by the Antiochian scholar, Theodore of Mopsuestia (saec. iv.-v.).]

V

ISIDORE, BISHOP OF SEVILLE

(*a*) In Libros Veteris ac Novi Testamenti Prohoemia[3]

(600 A.D. ?)

1. Plenitudo Noui et Veteris Testamenti, quam in Canone Catholica recipit Ecclesia, iuxta uetustam priorum traditionem ista[4] est. . . . (11) Hinc occurrit Testamentum Nouum, cuius primum Euangeliorum libri sunt

[1] This punctuation is due to Westcott.
[2] This word appears to mean *rejected, cast out.*
[3] From Arevalo's edition, tom. v. (Rome, 1802), pp. 190 ff.
[4] In the usual sense of later Latin = *haec.*

quattuor, scilicet Mattheus, Marcus, Lucas, et Iohannes. Sequuntur deinde epistulae Pauli apostoli quattuordecim, id est, ad Romanos, ad Corinthios duae, ad Galatas, ad Ephesios, ad Philippenses, ad Thessalonicenses duae, ad Colossenses, ad Timotheum duae, ad Titum uero et ad Philemonem et ad Hebraeos singulae. (12) Epistulae [1] quoque Iohannis apostoli tres, Petri duae, Iudae et Iacobi singulae. (13) Actus etiam Apostolorum et Apocalypsis Iohannis. Fiunt ergo in ordine utriusque testamenti libri septuaginta et duo. (14) Haec sunt enim *noua* et *uetera*, quae *de thesauro* domini *proferuntur*,[2] e quibus cuncta sacramentorum mysteria reuelantur. Hi sunt duo seraphin, qui in confessione sanctae trinitatis iugiter decantantes [3] tris hagios [4] hymnum erumpunt. (15) Haec etiam *duae oliuae* in Zacharia, quae *a dextris et sinistris lampadis* adstant,[5] atque *pinguedine*, et splendore spiritus sancti totum orbem doctrinae claritate inluminant. (16) Hae litterae sacrae, hi libri integri numero et auctoritate: aliud cum istis nihil est comparandum. Quidquid extra hos fuerit, inter haec sancta et diuina nullatenus est recipiendum.

(*b*) Etymologiae: Liber VI.; De Libris et Officiis Ecclesiasticis (before 636 A.D.)

Cap. i. § 10. In Nouo Testamento duo sunt ordines. Primus euangelicus, in quo sunt Matthaeus, Marcus, Lucas et Iohannes. Secundus apostolicus, in quo sunt Paulus in quattuordecim Epistolis, Petrus in duabus, Iohannes in tribus, Iacobus et Iudas in singulis, Actus Apostolorum et Apocalypsin [6] Iohannis.

Cap. ii. §§ 34-49 also of interest in this connexion.

Cap. ii. § 45. Ad Hebraeos autem Epistola plerisque

[1] At this point Westcott (p. 584) prefers to follow certain MSS. of the British Museum. Isidore varies in the order in which he gives the Catholic epistles.

[2] Cf. Matt. xiii. 52.

[3] *Certantes* (*B. M.* MSS.).

[4] The reference is to Isa. vi. 3. For the teaching of the passage cf. Hier. *Epist.* 18A, 7, § 5. The works of Isidore are (from first to last) a compilation from earlier authors.

[5] Cf. Zech. iv. 11-14.

[6] As indeclinable nom.; cf. *pentecosten* used for all cases (Marx's Filaster, index, p. 166; Souter's Pseudo-Augustini *Quaestiones*, index, p. 563; Turner's *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta*, i. p. 152).

Latinis eius esse incerta est propter dissonantiam sermonis, eandemque alii Barnaban conscripsisse, alii a Clemente scriptam fuisse suspicantur.

Cap. ii. §§ 50-53. Hi sunt scriptores sacrorum librorum, qui per spiritum sanctum loquentes ad eruditionem nostram et praecepta uiuendi et credendi regulam conscripserunt. Praeter haec alia uolumina apocrypha nuncupantur. Apocrypha autem dicta, id est secreta, quia in dubium ueniunt.[1] Est enim eorum occulta origo nec patet patribus, a quibus usque ad nos auctoritas ueracium scripturarum certissima et notissima successione peruenit. In eis apocryphis etsi inuenitur aliqua ueritas, tamen propter multa falsa nulla est in eis canonica auctoritas ; quae recte a prudentibus iudicantur non esse eorum credenda, quibus adscribuntur. Nam multa et sub nominibus prophetarum, et recentiora sub nominibus apostolorum ab haereticis proferuntur, quae omnia sub nomine apocryphorum auctoritate canonica diligenti examinatione remota sunt.

W

A SEVENTH-CENTURY LIST FROM *CODEX VATICANUS REGINAE*, 199 (SAEC. XII.)

Duobus sine dubio modis tota scriptura intellegenda est. primus itaque modus est intellegendi ut qui sunt[2] libri qui scribendi legendi retinendi sunt[2] ecclesia catholica intellegat. secundus autem modus est ut qui sunt[2] libri, qui nec legendi nec scribendi nec recipiendi sunt sciat.

Ordo itaque diuinorum librorum, quos ecclesia catholica scribere legere recipere[3] debet, secundum traditionem sanctorum uirorum et orthodoxorum patrum, hoc est Gelasii papae cum LXX. episcopis, eruditissimis uiris, in sede apostolica urbis Romae, et secundum traditionem sancti Athanasii episcopi Alexandriae[4] ciuitatis.

Hoc est uetus testamentum. . . .

[1] This view, of course, is absurd.
[2] Read *sint*. [3] Note the legal ring about the unconnected words.
[4] Certainly read *Alexandrinae* (for the corruption compare the critical note on Ps.-Aug., *Quaest. Vet. et Nov. Test.*, cxiii. 25, p. 314, 25 of my edition).

Veteris testamenti libri simul
numero uersuum $\overline{\text{LXXII}}$CCCXLVIII. (*i.e.* 72,348)
Noui testamenti libri hi sunt.
IIII. euangelia qui ex magistrorum
nomine sunt nominati :
Matheus hebraice, Donatus
latine dicitur, numero
uersuum $\overline{\text{II}}$DC. (*i.e.* 2600)
Marcus Excelsus interpre-
tatur, numero uersuum $\overline{\text{I}}$DCC. (*i.e.* 1700)
Lucas iste Consurgens in-
terpretatur, numero ver-
suum $\overline{\text{II}}$DCCC. (*i.e.* 2800)
Iohannes Gratia Dei inter-
pretatur, numero ver-
suum $\overline{\text{II}}$CCC. (*i.e.* 2300)
Actus Apostolorum, numero ver-
suum $\overline{\text{II}}$DCCC. (*i.e.* 2800)
Epistulae apostolorum canonicae
VII., numero uersuum CCXX.
Epistulae Pauli apostoli XIIII.
numero uersuum $\overline{\text{V}}$CI. (*i.e.* 5101)
Apocalipsis Iohannis apostoli,
quae interpretatur Reuelatio,
numero uersuum $\overline{\text{I}}$DCCCL. (*i.e.* 1850)
Libri simul noui testamenti, nu-
mero uersuum $\overline{\text{XX}}$CCCXX. (*i.e.* 20,320)
Utriusque testamenti simul libri,
numero uersuum $\overline{\text{CCII}}$DCLXVIII. (*i.e.* 202,668)

[*Note.*—As Mr. C. H. Turner, whose edition I am kindly permitted to reprint above (*Journ. Theol. Studies*, vol. ii. p. 239 ff.), has pointed out, this list is related to Document N. In its present form, however, W cannot be earlier than the seventh century, as the mention of Pope Gelasius and the likeness to Isidore's language show. The reference to Athanasius may be due to knowledge of Document E, as the compiler is hardly likely to have got his information about Hebrew except from a Greek source, and was therefore presumably acquainted with Greek. Furthermore, the stichometry has, as Mr. Turner has pointed out, got Greek analogies. The Latin definitions of the Evangelists' names are also to be found in the prologue to Pseudo-Jerome on the Four Gospels.]

X

ACTS OF COUNCIL OF TRENT (*CONCILIUM TRIDENTINUM*) (1546)

Sacrosancta oecumenica et generalis Tridentina synodus, in spiritu sancto legitime congregata . . . orthodoxorum patrum exempla secuta, omnes libros tam veteris quam novi testamenti, cum utriusque unus deus sit auctor, nec non traditiones ipsas tum ad fidem tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel ore tenus a Christo vel a spiritu sancto dictatas et continua successione in ecclesia catholica conservatas, pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit et veneratur. Sacrorum vero librorum indicem huic decreto adscribendum censuit, ne cui dubitatio suboriri possit, quinam sint qui ab ipsa synodo suscipiuntur. Sunt vero infra scripti . . . [*Old Testament and Apocrypha*] . . . Testamenti novi, quatuor Evangelia, . . . Actus Apostolorum a Luca evangelista conscripti. Quatuordecim epistolae Pauli apostoli, ad Romanos . . . ad Hebraeos. Petri apostoli duae, Joannis apostoli tres, Jacobi apostoli[1] una, Judae apostoli una, et Apocalypsis Joannis apostoli.

Siquis autem libros ipsos integros cum omnibus suis partibus, prout in ecclesia catholica legi consueverunt, et in veteri Vulgata Latina editione habentur, pro sacris et canonicis non susceperit, et traditiones praedictas sciens et prudens contempserit, ANATHEMA SIT. . . .

DECRETUM DE EDITIONE ET USU SACRORUM LIBRORUM

Insuper eadem sacrosancta synodus, considerans non parum utilitatis accedere posse ecclesiae dei, si ex omnibus Latinis editionibus quae circumferuntur sacrorum librorum, quaenam pro authentica habenda sit, innotescat, statuit et declarat, ut haec ipsa vetus et vulgata editio, quae longo tot seculorum usu in ipsa Ecclesia probata est, in publicis lectionibus, disputationibus, praedicationibus et expositionibus pro authentica[2] habeatur et ut nemo illam rejicere quovis pretextu audeat vel presumat. Praeterea

[1] Note the addition of 'apostoli' here, which does not imply belief in the authorship of the son of Zebedee.

[2] Cf. 2 Peter iii. 16.—A. S.

ad coercenda petulantia ingenia decernit, ut nemo suae prudentiae innixus in rebus fidei et morum ad aedificationem doctrinae Christianae pertinentium sacram scripturam ad suos sensus contorquens,[1] contra eum sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater Ecclesia, cuius est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione scripturarum sanctarum, aut etiam contra unanimem consensum patrum ipsam scripturam sacram interpretari audeat, etiam si huiusmodi interpretationes nullo unquam tempore in lucem edendae forent. Qui contravenerint, per ordinarios[2] declarentur et poenis a jure statutis puniantur.

[*Note.—Authentica* is to be taken in relation to other Latin translations which were in circulation, not to the original Hebrew or Greek. It practically means 'authoritative,' and that it gives substantially the original text, and contains no error against faith or morals. See Jacquier, *Nouveau Testament*, etc., tom. i. pp. 390 ff.]

[1] Cf. 2 Peter iii. 16.—A. S.

[2] *I.e.* the Bishops. The Church of England still uses the expression 'the Ordinary.'—A. S.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

THE TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

The best works on the textual criticism of the New Testament are probably the following:—Richard Simon, *Histoire Critique du Texte du Nouveau Testament* (Rotterdam, 1689), *Histoire Critique des Versions du N.T.* (*ibid.* 1690), *Nouvelles Observations sur le Texte et les Versions du N.T.* (*ibid.* 1695); Prolegomena to Mill's edition of the Greek N.T. (Oxford, 1707, and later); Preface to Lachmann's edition of the Greek and Latin New Testament, vol. i. (Berlin, 1842); Introduction to Westcott and Hort's New Testament in the Original Greek (Cambr. and Lond., 1881, best edition, 1896); C. R. Gregory, *Textkritik des Neuen Testamentes* (Leipzig, 1900-9), a vast repertory of material, *Canon and Text of the New Testament* (Edinburgh, 1908), considerably improved in the *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Leipzig, 1909), works which yield to none in the interesting way they are written; H. v. Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte, I Teil, Untersuchungen* (Berlin, 1902-10), over two thousand large pages, a work of the greatest importance, which will have an incalculable influence on future editions of the text; F. G. Kenyon, *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (London, 1901, 2nd ed., 1912), by one of our greatest authorities on papyri and early vellum MSS.; Eb. Nestle, *Einführung in das Griechische Neue Testament* (3te umgearbeitete Auflage, mit 12 Handschriften-Tafeln) (Göttingen, 1909), at once the most up-to-date and useful for all except specialists, and not to be neglected even by them, antiquating the English translation of the second edition (London, 1901); nor must the very important articles in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. v. (J. O. F. Murray), *Encyclopædia Biblica* (F. C. Burkitt, containing a large amount of first-hand research, and always valuable), and Murray's *Illustrated Bible Dictionary* (C. H. Turner: a model of succinctness and clearness) be neglected, or the thoroughly readable articles of C. H. Turner in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vols. x. and xi. (1908-10).

CHAPTER I

Principles of Textual Criticism: works enumerated above; also W. M. Lindsay, *An Introduction to Latin Textual Emendation* (London, 1896); L. Havet, *Manuel de Critique Verbale appliquée aux Textes Latins* (Paris, 1911).

For an example where original and copy both survive, instructive for study: see F. W. Shipley in the *American Journal of Archæology*, vol. vii. (1903), pp. 1-25, 57-97, 105-28 (two MSS. of part of Livy).

Palæographical Works: Sir E. M. Thompson, *Handbook to Greek and Latin Palæography* (2nd ed., London, 1894), to be compared with later works, especially as regards papyri (the Clarendon Press announces a new work by him); L. Traube, *Nomina Sacra, Versuch einer Geschichte der christlichen Kürzung* (Munich, 1907), *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen*, Bd. i. (Munich, 1909), Bd. ii. (*ibid.* 1910, dated 1911); F. G. Kenyon, *Palæography of Greek Papyri* (Oxford, 1899); U. Wilcken, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* (begun Leipzig, 1901, now in fifth volume), a journal for students of papyri, of masterly comprehensiveness, edited by the greatest living papyrologist; articles by Kenyon in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, and by Deissmann in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. Best collection of texts in Mitteis and Wilcken, *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde*, 2 Bde. (Leipzig, 1911): more readily accessible is G. Milligan, *Selections from the Greek Papyri*, with translations and notes (Cambridge, 1910); sacred texts collected in C. Wessely, *Les Plus Anciens Monuments du Christianisme écrits sur Papyrus* (= *Patrologia Orientalis*, iv. 2) (Paris, 1907).

Complete photographs of MSS. are generally referred to under the MSS. themselves: the following collections of photographs of single pages of various MSS. are only one or two of a great many now accessible: P. F. de' Cavalieri and I. Lietzmann, *Specimina Codicum Graecorum Vaticanorum* (Bonn, 1910), 50 photographs, price six shillings; W. Schubart, *Papyri Graecae Berolinenses* (Bonn, 1911), same number and price; F. Ehrle and P. Liebaert, *Specimina Codicum Latinorum Vaticanorum* (Bonn, 1912), same number and price.

On contractions: T. W. Allen, *Notes on Abbreviations in Greek Manuscripts* (Oxford, 1889); Traube, *Nomina Sacra* (above); the scientific study of Latin abbreviations, begun by Traube, is being carried on especially by W. M. Lindsay, *Contractions in Early Latin Minuscule MSS.* (Oxford, 1908), *Early Irish Minuscule Script* (Oxford, 1910), and articles in the *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* for 1909 and later.

CHAPTER II

Eusebian Canons printed in the later editions of Nestle's *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Stuttgart), and elsewhere; the Latin, for

example, in White's *Novum Testamentum Latine*, ed. minor (Oxford and London, 1912 [dated 1911]), pp. xvii. ff.).

On Marcion's edition of St. Paul's Epistles, see the literature on Document A.

On Euthalius, J. A. Robinson, *Euthaliana* (Cambridge, 1895); H. v. Soden, *Die Schriften d. N.T.*, 1 Teil (Berl. 1902), pp. 637-82; J. A. Robinson, in *Journal of Theological Studies*, vi. (1904-5), pp. 87 ff.; and further literature in Nestle, *op. cit.*, p. 209.

On bilingual MSS., consult J. M. Heer in *Oriens Christianus*, Neue Serie, ii. 1 (1912), pp. 9 ff.

CHAPTER III

Lists, and sometimes descriptions, of Greek MSS. of the New Testament (parts or whole) in Gregory's *Textkritik*, pp. 16-478, 1017-1292, 1363-76, 1418-84; H. v. Soden, *Die Schriften d. N.T.*, Bd. i., pp. 102-289; C. R. Gregory, *Die griechischen Handschriften d. Neuen Testaments* (Leipzig, 1908), an account of his revised numeration: a select list of those cited in the apparatus, with Gregory's and Von Soden's numbers, dates, contents and libraries where preserved, in my *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Oxonii, 1910), pp. vii-xv. Newly discovered MSS. in Gregory, *Vorschläge für eine kritische Ausgabe des griechischen Neuen Testaments* (Leipzig, 1911), pp. 34 ff.; T. Kluge, *Zeitschrift f. d. neut. Wiss.*, xiii. (1912), pp. 267 ff.

Photograph of $\mathfrak{p}^1$ in *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. i. (Oxford, 1898), plate 1; Nestle, *Einführung*, Taf. 11: $\mathfrak{p}^{13}$ in *New Palæographical Society, facsimiles*.

Complete photograph of B, published by Hoepli (Milan, 1904).

Complete photograph of ℵ (N.T. and Barnabas), with introduction by Lake (Oxford, 1911), £8, 8s. 'An Examination of some Omissions of the *Codex Sinaiticus* in St. John's Gospel,' by H. S. Cronin, in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. xiii. (1911-12), pp. 563-71.

Complete photograph of A (N.T. and Clementine Epistles) in reduced size (London, 1909), £1, 10s.

C, edited by Tischendorf (1843).

D, well edited by Scrivener (Cambridge, 1864): complete photograph (Cambridge, 1899), £12, 12s. Complete list of readings of D most easily obtained in E. Nestle, *Novi Testamenti Graeci Supplementum* (Lipsiae, 1896). Burkitt in *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. iii. (1900-1), pp. 501-13; J. Rendel Harris, *A Study of 'Codex Bezae'* (Cambridge, 1891); F. H. Chase (Bishop of Ely), *The Old Syriac Element in the Text of 'Codex Bezae'* (London, 1893); Lake and Brightman in *Journal of Theological Studies*, i. (1909-10), pp. 441-54.

D^{paul}, edited by Tischendorf (Lipsiae, 1852); see also P. Corssen progr. (Kiel, 1887, 9).

E, edited by Tischendorf (1870).

H, some leaves (or offsets) photographed in K. Lake, *Facsimiles of the Athos Fragments of Codex H of the Pauline Epistles* (Oxford, 1905), Omont in *Notices et Extraits des MSS. de la Bibl. Nat.*, t. xxxiii. (Paris, 1889), pp. 141-92; J. Armitage Robinson, *Euthaliana* (Cambridge, 1895).

L, edited by Tischendorf (1846).

N, edited by H. S. Cronin, *Codex Purpureus Petropolitanus* (Cambridge, 1899).

O, edited by H. Omont in *Notices et Extraits*, t. xxxxvi. and separately (Paris, 1901).

Σ, edited by O. von Gebhardt (Leipzig, 1883): cf. Sanday in *Studia Biblica*, vol. i. (Oxford, 1885), pp. 103-12.

Φ, edited by Batiffol (Paris, 1886).

W, see Gregory, *Das Freer Logion* (Versüche und Entwürfe, i.) (Leipzig, 1908).

CHAPTER IV

Old-Latin Version(s): Greek as the official language of the Roman East: R. Cagnat, *Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas pertinentes* (Paris, 1901 ff., in progress); Viereck, *Sermo Graecus quo Senatus Populusque Romanus . . . usi sunt . . .* (Göttingen, 1888); Magie, *De Romanorum Iuris Publici Sacrique Vocabulis Sollemnibus in Graecum Sermonem Conversis* (Halle-a-S., 1904); L. Hahn, *Rom und Romanismus im griechisch-römischen Osten* (Leipzig, 1906). Extensive bibliography on the use of Greek throughout the Roman world in the notes to chap. i. of Zahn's *Introduction to the New Testament* (Eng. tr.) (Edinburgh, 1910).

Roman Christian Africa: Dom H. Leclercq, *L'Afrique Chrétienne*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1904). Its literature: P. Monceaux, *Histoire Littéraire de l'Afrique Chrétienne*, 4 vols. published (Paris, 1901 ff., in progress). Biblical quotations of African Fathers, see chap. vii. and bibliography.

'African' MSS.: *k*: edited (with photograph) by Wordsworth, Sanday and White in *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, vol. ii. (Oxford, 1886); valuable gleanings by Burkitt and Turner in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. v. (1903-4), pp. 88-107; re-edited by Hans von Soden, *Das Lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur Zeit Cyprians* (Leipzig, 1909); palæographical notes in L. Traube, *Nomina Sacra* (Munich, 1907), pp. 138 ff. *e*: edited by Tischendorf (Leipzig, 1847); see also J. H. Todd, *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, vol. iii. (1846); H. Linke in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Bavarian Academy, *phil.-hist. Cl.*, 1893 (2), pp. 281-7; re-edited in Hans von Soden, *op. cit.* *h*: edited (with photograph) by S. Berger, *Le*

Palimpseste de Fleury (Paris, 1889); re-edited (with photograph) by E. S. Buchanan, *Old-Latin Biblical Texts, No. V.* (Oxford, 1907), and Hans von Soden, *op. cit.*; see also *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. ix. (1907-8), pp. 98-100 (Buchanan), xi. (1909-10), pp. 563 f. (Souter). *r*: edited by Ziegler, *Italafragmente der paulinischen Briefe* (Marburg, 1876): further portions by Ed. von Wölfflin in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Bavarian Academy for 1893 (2), pp. 253-80, and by G. Morin in the *Revue Bénédictine*, xxviii. (1911), pp. 221-7.

European MSS.: *a*: edited by Irico (1748), Bianchini, *Evangeliarium Quadruplex* (1749) (whose edition is reprinted in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. xii.). A new edition will be produced by the Vatican Commission for the revision of the Vulgate (see 'Note upon the present state of the Vercelli Gospels' in *The Revision of the Vulgate; Second Report of Work Done* (St. Anselm's, Rome, 1911), pp. 20-8). Other references in the text. *b*: edited by E. S. Buchanan in *Old-Latin Biblical Texts, No. VI.* (Oxford, 1911). Cf. Burkitt in *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. i. (1899-1900), p. 134. Photographs of pages in Buchanan and in *Monumenta Palaeographica Sacra*, by F. Carta, C. Cipolla, and C. Frati (Turin, 1899), tav. ii. and p. 2. Other references in the text. *ff*: edited by E. S. Buchanan in *Old-Latin Biblical Texts, No. V.* (Oxford, 1907); photograph there; see also Buchanan in *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. vii. (1905-6), pp. 99 ff., 236 ff. *q*: edited by H. J. White in *Old-Latin Biblical Texts, No. III.* (Oxford, 1888); photograph there and in A. Chroust, *Monumenta Palaeographica*, i. Ser. vi. Lief., Taf. 1 (Munich, 1902). See also De Bruyne in the *Revue Bénédictine*, xxviii. (1911), pp. 75-80. *f*: text printed in Wordsworth and White's *Nouum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine*, tom. i. (Oxonii, 1889-98) under the Vulgate. See Burkitt, *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. i. (1899-1900), pp. 129-34, xi. (1909-10), pp. 611-13; F. Kauffmann, 'Beiträge zur Quellenkritik der gotischen Bibelübersetzung,' in the *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, xxxii. (1899), pp. 305-35; J. Dräseke, 'Der Goten Sunja und Frithila Praefatio zum *Codex Brixianus*,' in the *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, L. (1907), pp. 107-17; W. Streitberg, *Die Gotische Bibel* (Heidelberg, 1908), pp. xliii. ff. *giess*: published (with photograph) in the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, xi. (1910), pp. 1-38 (and separately), by P. Glaue and K. Helm, reviewed by Burkitt, *l.c.* *gig*: inaccurately edited by J. Belsheim (Christiania, 1879), recollated for Wordsworth and White in *Acts* and *Apocalypse* by H. Karlsson (see W.-W.'s edition of *Acts*), and in *Acts* by H. Hilgenfeld (see his edition of *Acts*, published in 1899). Other literature in the text. *p*: edited for the Old-Latin portions of *Acts* by S. Berger, in *Notices et Extraits*, xxxv. (Paris, 1895), and separately; the Catholic Epistles, edited by E. S. Buchanan, in *Journal of Theological Studies*, xii. (1910-11), pp. 497-534.

Gg: complete photograph published by Hiersemann (ed. Reichardt) (Leipzig, 1909). *ff*: edited by Bishop Wordsworth in *Studia Biblica*, vol. i. (Oxford, 1885), pp. 113-50; cf. Dr. Sanday in the same volume, pp. 233-63; re-edited by A. Staerk, *Les Manuscrits Latins du V^e^ au XIII^e^ siècle conservés à la Bibliothèque Impériale de Saint-Pétersbourg.* tome i. (St. Petersburg, 1910), pp. 132 ff. (photograph of first page in vol. ii. plate lix.). *m*: edited by F. Weihrich in the *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, vol. xii. (Vindob, 1887). A valuable restoration and study of the Old-Latin texts of the Johannine Epistles (in which the evidence of Ps.-Aug. *Quaest.* is unfortunately omitted) in A. E. Brooke's *Johannine Epistles* (Intern. Crit. Comm.) (Edinburgh, 1912), pp. 197-223.

LATIN (VULGATE): article 'Vulgate' in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, by Prof. H. J. White; S. Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate* . . . (Paris, 1893). Critical edition with copious apparatus, introduction and epilogue (Gospels and Acts published, Romans about to be published) is Wordsworth and White's *Nouum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine* . . . (Oxonii, 1889-1905); smaller critical edition with select apparatus of whole New Testament, by H. J. White, *Nouum Testamentum Latine secundum Editionem Sancti Hieronymi* . . . (Oxonii, 1912 [dated 1911]) (published also by British and Foreign Bible Society); an exact edition of the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate N.T., with the readings of Wordsworth and White, as far as published, and with other valuable critical material, is Eb. Nestle, *Novum Testamentum Latine* (obtainable also with the Greek on the opposite page) (Stuttgart, 1906, and later). Other literature is referred to in the text. Gutenberg's 42-line Bible is being produced in complete facsimile by H. Welter, Paris (£30), as well as by the Insel-Verlag in Leipzig (£35). A most suggestive work is Dom John Chapman's *Notes on the Early History of the Vulgate Gospels* (Oxford, 1908). On the Pius X. Revision see above under *a*. Interesting works on MSS., which are neither pure Vulgate nor pure Old-Latin, are H. J. Lawlor, *Chapters on the Book of Mulling* (Edinburgh, 1897); H. C. Hoskier, *The Golden Latin Gospels*, etc. (New York, 1910, privately printed); *Concerning the Genesis of the Versions of the New Testament*, vol. ii. (London, 1911); J. M. Heer, *Evangelium Gatianum* (Freiburg-i.-B., 1910); E. S. Buchanan, *The Codex Harleianus* 1772 *of the Epistles and the Apocalypse* (London, 1912). *Codex Amiatinus*, edited by Tischendorf (Leipzig, 1850 and 1854); on the history of the MS. consult H. J. White in *Studia Biblica*, vol. ii. (Oxford, 1890), pp. 273-308 [the orthography, Dr. Sanday, pp. 309-24], and P. Corssen in *Jahrbuch für protestantische Theologie* for 1891, as well as Dom J. Chapman in the *Revue Bénédictine* for July and October 1911. *Codex Fuldensis*, edited by E. Ranke (Marburg, 1868), photograph in K. Scherer, *Die Codices Bonifatiani in der Landesbibliothek zu Fulda* (Fulda, 1905).

SYRIAC VERSIONS: Tatian's Diatessaron: *The Earliest Life of Christ*, etc., by J. Hamlyn Hill (Edinburgh, 1893, cheaper edition, 1911); translated also by H. W. Hogg in Ante-Nicene Christian Library, additional volume (Edinburgh, 1897); see more literature in Nestle, *Einführung* (3rd ed.), p. 119, and compare chapter vii.; add now S. Euringer in Bardenhewer's *Biblische Studien XVII.* (2) (Freib.-i.-B., 1912). Ephraim's Commentary on the Diatessaron, translated into Latin (Venice, 1893). The Old-Syriac Version: readings of both MSS. together, Curetonian as text, Sinaitic as apparatus, in Burkitt's *Evangelion da-Mepharreshê*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1904), with introduction, translation, and notes, indispensable to the student of New Testament textual criticism; Sinaitic as text, Curetonian as apparatus, in the edition of Mrs. A. S. Lewis (London, 1910); valuable also is A. Merx, *Die vier kanonischen Evangelien nach ihrem ältesten bekannten Texte*, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1897-1911, last volume posthumous), with its copious textual notes. A. Hjelt in Zahn's *Forschungen*, Bd. vii. (1) (Leipzig, 1903), contends for the priority of the Old-Syriac over the Diatessaron. The Peshitta Revision: edited by Widmanstadt (Vienna, 1555), by Leusden and Schaaf (Lugd. Bat., 1709), by Pusey and Gwilliam (Gospels only) (Oxford, 1901). The older view of the Peshitta is upheld by, amongst others, Burgon and Miller in *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels Vindicated and Established* (London, 1896), *The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels* (London, 1896), and in other works. The Philoxenian Version: Apocalypse, edited by John Gwynn (Dublin, 1897); Second Peter, Second and Third John, Jude, edited by John Gwynn (Text and Translation Society) (London, 1909). The Harclean Revision: edited by Joseph White (Oxford, 1778-1803); R. L. Bensly, *The Harklean Version of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, chap. xi. 28-xiii. 25, *now edited for the first time* (Cambridge, 1889); cf. also Ad. Hilgenfeld's edition of Acts (Berlin, 1899), and A. V. Valentine Richards' review of it in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. i. (1899-1900), pp. 606 ff. The Palestinian Version: *The Palestinian Syriac Lectionary of the Gospels re-edited . . .*, by A. S. Lewis and M. D. Gibson (London, 1899); F. C. Burkitt, 'The Palestinian Syriac Lectionary' (*Journal of Theological Studies*, vi. (1904-5), pp. 91-8); cf. also Nestle, *Einf.*[3], pp. 120 f.

CHAPTER V

On the Ptolemies' libraries, etc., see F. Susemihl, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, especially Bd. ii. (Leipzig, 1892), chap. 38, and Bd. i. (Leipzig, 1892), pp. 337-44.

Egyptian Versions: Guidi in Göttingen *Nachrichten* for 1889, pp. 49 ff., quoted by Burkitt, 'Text and Versions,' in *Encyclopædia*

Biblica; Leipoldt, *Geschichte des neutest. Kanons*, Bd. i. (Leipzig, 1907), pp. 81 f.; Forbes Robinson, 'Egyptian Versions,' in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i. pp. 668-73.

Sahidic Version: Gospels edited in *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect, otherwise called Sahidic and Thebaic* . . . [by Rev. G. W. Horner], 3 vols. (Oxford, 1911); the rest of the New Testament must meantime be sought in C. G. Woide and H. Ford (Oxford, 1799); P. Balestri, *Sacrorum Bibliorum Fragmenta Copto-sahidica Musei Borgiani*, vol. iii. (Rome, 1904), and elsewhere; great part of the Apocalypse in H. Goussen, *Studia Theologica*, fasc. i. (Leipzig, 1897).

Bohairic Version: edited in *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect, otherwise called Memphitic and Bohairic* . . . [by Rev. G. W. Horner], 4 vols. (Oxford, 1898-1905).

Gothic Version; *Die gotische Bibel*, herausg. v. Wilhelm Streitberg, 1 Teil, *Der gotische Text u. seine griechische Vorlage u. s. w.* (Heidelberg, 1908); see also the bibliography to Chapter IV. under *f* and *giess.*

CHAPTER VI

Armenian Versions: N.T. edited by J. Zohrab (Venice, 1789); both forms of the Apocalypse by F. C. Conybeare (Text and Translation Society) (London, 1907); cf. J. R. Harris, *Four Lectures on the Western Text* (Cambridge, 1894); J. A. Robinson, *Euthaliana* (Cambridge, 1895), pp. 72-98; F. C. Conybeare in the *American Journal of Theology*, Oct. 1897; F. C. Burkitt, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshê*, ii. (Cambridge, 1904), p. 160. Variants of the Armenian in the Gospels are given direct from the original Armenian (ed. Zohrab) by Horner in his edition of the Sahidic Version. On the Etschmiadzin MS. (of A.D. 986), which mentions 'the presbyter Ariston,' see F. C. Conybeare in *The Expositor*, 1893, ii. pp. 241 ff. (photograph of the page in Nestle, *Einf.*[3], Taf. 9). More literature in Nestle, *Einf.*[3], p. 157.

Ethiopic Version: edition of the British and Foreign Bible Society, from which readings are taken direct in Horner's edition of the Sahidic Version. Literature in Nestle, *Einf.*[3], pp. 155 f. I borrow the following references to recent literature from J. M. Heer in *Oriens Christianus* for 1912, p. 24, n. 2; Hoberg-Kaulen, *Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift*, I[5] (Freiburg, 1911), pp. 233 f.; Littmann, *Geschichte der äthiopischen Literatur.* (*Die Literaturen des Ostens in Einzeldarstellungen*, vii. 2) (Leipzig), pp. 223 ff.; A. Baumstark, *Die christlichen Literaturen des Orients* (Sammlung Göschen), ii. (Leipzig, 1911), pp. 39 ff.; J. Guidi, *Le Traduzioni degli Evangelii in Arabo ed in Etiopico* (Rome, 1888).

Georgian Version: edited Moscow, 1743, and later: many MSS. not yet used, cf. 'Georgian Manuscripts at the Iberian Monastery

on Mount Athos,' by O. Wardrop, in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. xii. (1910-11), pp. 593 ff. Other literature in the text above.

Arabic Version: edited Calcutta, 1816: with Bohairic, by Tattam and Cureton (London, 1847-52): Gospels by P. de Lagarde (Leipzig, 1864): facsimile of Arabic-Latin leaf in Ehrle and Liebaert's *Specimina* (Bonn, 1912).

CHAPTER VII

Most of the literature is given in the chapter itself: add Ll. J. M. Bebb in *Studia Biblica*, vol. ii. (Oxford, 1890), pp. 195 ff.; on CHRYSOSTOM, Westcott, *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament* (4th ed., London, 1875), p. xxxii. n. 1; S. K. Gifford, *Pauli Epistolas qua forma legerit Joannes Chrysostomus* (Halle, 1902); J. A. Nairn, appendix to his edition of the *De Sacerdotio* of St. John Chrysostom (Cambridge, 1906); on TERTULLIAN, H. Rönsch, *Das Neue Testament Tertullians* (Leipzig, 1871); on NOVATIAN, Burkitt, 'Texts and Versions' in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. In general, consult the literature cited under Chapter IV., with reference to particular MSS. referred to in the text.

CHAPTER VIII

On printed editions of the Greek New Testament, Nestle, *Einführung* (ed. 2 or 3), chap. i., where much literature is given; a standard work is Ed. Reuss, *Bibliotheca Novi Testamenti Graeci* (Braunschweig, 1872). There are many special monographs on particular editions, *e.g.* H. C. Hoskier, *A Full Account and Collation of the Greek Cursive Codex Evangelium* 604 (London, 1890), Appendix B and Appendix C (cf. Nestle in *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. xi. (1909-10), pp. 564 ff.); J. R. Harris, 'Some Notes on the Verse Division of the New Testament' (in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* for 1900). Further bibliography in the text.

CHAPTER IX

See the bibliography to Chapter I. Add J. Gow, *Companion to School Classics* (2nd ed., London, 1889), pp. 1-69; J. P. Postgate in Sandys' *Companion to Latin Studies* (Cambridge, 1910), pp. 791-805. On the conclusion of St. Mark, J. W. Burgon, *The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel according to St. Mark* (London, 1871), heroic but unconvincing; Westcott and Hort's Appendix, pp. 29 ff.; F. C. Conybeare in the *Expositor* for 1893, ii. pp. 241 ff., 1894, ii. pp. 219 ff., 1895, ii. pp. 401 ff.; C. R. Gregory, *Das Freer Logion* (Leipzig, 1908); J. M. Heer in *Oriens Christianus* for 1912, pp. 1 ff;

A. Bauer in *Wiener Studien*, xxxiv. (1912), pp. 301 ff., etc. etc. Other literature in the text.

CHAPTER X

Literature in the text.

THE CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

Westcott's *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament during the First Four Centuries* (London, 1855, and now in a seventh edition). This work, which has stood the test of criticism for two generations, only requires to be brought up to date to remain the standard English authority. Sanday's 'Inspiration' (*Bampton Lectures*) (London, 1893) is most valuable, both for a general view and for details.

Zahn's *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*, two vols., each in two parts (Leipzig, 1888-92), a vast repertory of all the facts down to the time of Origen: it is indispensable to the advanced student. No less so is his *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur* (Leipzig, 1881-1907), of which the following eight parts have appeared: (1) 'Tatian's Diatessaron.' (2) 'Der Evangeliencommentar des Theophilus von Antiochien' [on which see Sanday in *Studia Biblica*, vol. i. (Oxford, 1885), pp. 89-101]. (3) 'Supplementum Clementinum.' (4) 'Die lateinische Apokalypse der alten afrikanischen Kirche,' von J. Haussleiter; 'Der Text des von A. Ciasca herausgegebenen arabischen Diatessaron,' von D. E. Sellin; 'Analecta zur Geschichte und Literatur der Kirche im zweiten Jahrhundert.' (5) 'Paralipomena'; 'Die Apologie des Aristides untersucht und wiederhergestellt,' von R. Seeberg. (6) 'Apostel und Apostelschüler in der Provinz Asien'; 'Brüder und Vettern Jesu.' (7) 'Die altsyrische Evangelienübersetzung und Tatian's Diatessaron besonders in ihrem gegenseitigen Verhältnis,' untersucht von A. Hjelt. (8) 'Die ältesten lateinischen Kommentare zum Hebräerbrief,' von E. Riggenbach.

Th. Zahn, *Grundriss der Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, 2 Aufl. (Leipzig, 1904), a supplement to his *Introduction to the New Testament*, is the cheapest and most exact, useful and up-to-date compendium on the subject; A. Jülicher, *Einleitung in das N.T.*

(ed. 5-6) (Leipzig, 1906), contains a convenient summary; J. Leipoldt, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (Leipzig, 1907-8), distinguished by freshness of treatment, and particularly valuable where the ancient Egyptian Church and the early Reformers are discussed; E. Jacquier, *Le Nouveau Testament dans l'Eglise Chrétienne*, tome i. 'Préparation, formation et définition du Canon du Nouveau Testament' (Paris, 1911), a well-informed, attractive, up-to-date presentation.

As regards documents connected with the subject, see the appendixes in Westcott and Zahn, both his *Geschichte* and his *Grundriss*; also C. H. Turner, 'Latin Lists of the Canonical Books,' in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vols. i. pp. 554 ff., ii. pp. 236 ff., xiii. pp. 77 ff., 511 ff., and E. von Dobschütz, *Das Decretum Gelasianum de Libris Recipiendis et non Recipiendis*, u.s.w. (Leipzig, 1912), for the only critical edition of the 'Gelasianum.'

There is no need to add here a bibliography arranged according to the chapters of this book, but certain works may be mentioned which are not directly cited in the text.

Chapter IV. The most convenient and up-to-date editions of the 'Apostolic Fathers' and other early Christian writings (excluding the New Testament) are those in the series *Textes et Documents pour l'Étude Historique du Christianisme*, edited by H. Hemmer and P. Lejay, and published by Picard, Paris (1907 and later). The volumes are provided with introductions, complete translations in French, notes, and indexes.

Chapter V. On Junilius: H. Kihn, *Theodor von Mopsuestia und Iunilius Afrikanus als Exegeten*, u.s.w. (Freib.-i.-B., 1880).

Chapter VI. On the canonicity of Jude and of St. Peter, see full details in *The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter: Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Comments*, by Joseph B. Mayor (London, 1907), pp. cxv-cxxiii.

'The Influence of St. Jerome on the Canon of the Western Church,' by Sir Henry H. Howorth in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vols. x. (1908-9), pp. 481 ff., xi. (1909-10), pp. 321 ff., xiii. (1911-12), pp. 1 ff.

Chapter VIII. The following articles by Sir Henry H. Howorth in the *Journal of Theological Studies*: 'The Origin and Authority of the Biblical Canon according to the Continental Reformers,' vol. viii. (1906-7), pp. 321 ff., ix. (1907-8), pp. 188 ff.; 'The Canon of the Bible among the Later Reformers,' vol. x. (1908-9), pp. 183 ff.; 'The Origin and Authority of the Biblical Canon in the Anglican Church,' vol. viii. (1906-7), pp. 1 ff.

INDEX

ABYSSINIAN VERSION. *See* Ethiopic.
Accents, 7.
Acts of Andrew, 186.
—— of the Apostles, 7, 12, 153, 166.
—— of John, 167, 186.
—— of Judas Thomas, 92.
—— of Paul, 78.
—— of Peter, 167.
—— of Scillitan Martyrs, 35.
Addai, doctrine of, 225 f.
Ado, 26.
'Africa,' 35.
'African' Canon, 192.
'African' MSS., 36 ff., 43, 45, 47.
Alcuin, 51.
Alexandrian MSS., 122 ff.
Alfric, 193.
Alter, 100.
Ambrose, 88 f., 190.
'Ambrosiaster,' the, 42, 44 f., 47, 50, 88 f., 137 *n.*, 143, 190 ff.
Andreas of Cappadocia, 137, 188.
Antioch, 58, etc.
Aphraates, 59, 92 f., 183.
Apocalypse, 12, 15, 60 f., 85, 153, 166, 182, 185 ff.
'Apocrypha,' 158.
'Apostolic' canons, 81.
Arabic versions, 73 ff., 110.
Aristion, 72.
Armenian versions, 60, 63, 71 ff., 74, 109, 145.
Articles of Church of England, 203.
Assyrian Church canon, 183 ff. (*see* Documents); Nestorian, 188. *See* Syriac.
Athanasius, 84, 135 f., 155, 187.
Augustine, 38 f., 45 f., 50 f., 78, 81, 88 ff., 145, 191 f.
Aurelius of Cillani, 192.

'BARNABAS, EPISTLE OF,' 22, 76, 176, 179, 183.
Bar Salibi, 79.
Basil of Caesarea, 30, 84, 133.
Basmuric version. *See* Fayyumic.
Bede, viii, 29, 85, 91 f.
Benedictine Order, 9.
Bengel, 99.
Bensly, 128.
Bentley, 98 f.
Berger, 128.
Beza's editions, 96.
Bilinguals, 14.
Bindings, 8.
Birch, 100.
Bobbio, 37, 43 *n.*, 90.
Bohairic version, 65 ff., 124, 136 f., 145.
Boniface, 29, 53.
Books, their material, 5.
Bousset, 127 f.
Bowyer, 99.
Breathings, 7.
Buchanan, 107, 144 *n.*
Budge, 108.
Burchard, 29.
Burgon, 102.
Burkitt, 108, 128 f.
Burn, 129.
Buttmann, 101.

CAIETANUS, 200.
Calvin, 202.
Canon, 149 ff.

Carthage, Council of, 220 f.
Cassian, 191 f.
Cassiodorus, 3, 51, 54, 90 f., 193.
Chapters, 11.
Charlemagne, 197.
Chromatius of Aquileia, 46.
'Chrysostom,' John, 60, 69, 85, 100, 118, 133, 136, 186.
Citations, Patristic, 15 ff., 76 ff., 145.
Clement of Alexandria, 61, 67, 81, 83, 87, 173.
Clement VIII., Pope, 52, 106.
Clement, Letters of, 24, 34, 76, 179 f. *See* Pseudo-Clement.
'Clementine' Homilies, 78.
Colossians, Epistle to, 153.
Columns, 7.
Commentators, Patristic, 16 f., 92, 143 f.
Commodian, 87 *n.*
Complutensian Polyglot, 94 f.
Constantinople, 60, 69, 72, 84 f., etc.
Conybeare, 109 f.
Coptic version, *see* Bohairic; versions, *see* Egyptian.
Corinthians, First Epistle to, 153; Second Epistle to, 153; 'Third' Epistle to, 72, 181, 183 f.
Cosmas Indicopleustes, 21, 85.
Councils, 195 ff.; Laodicea, 195 f.; so-called Damasine, viii, 196, 218, 229 f.; Carthage, 196 f., 220 f.; Trent, 197, 236 f.
Crönert, 142.
Crum, 109.
Cursive writing, 5.
Cyprian, 36 ff., 78, 87, 90, 177.
Cyril of Alexandria, 21, 84, 124, 135 f.
Cyril of Jerusalem, 134, 136, 186.

Damasus, 48 f., 88; so-called Council of, a fiction, viii, 218.
Denk, 107.
Diatessaron, Tatian's, 53 ff., 59 f., 77 ff., 82, 92 f., 135, 161, 169 f., 177, 183.
Didache, 22, 76, 78, 183, 186 f.
Didymus, 135.
Diodorus, 118.
Dittography, 114.
Dobschütz, E. von, viii, 218, 229 f.
Donatists, 36; Donatist prologues, 52.
Donatus, grammarian, 48.

Editions, printed: Greek, 94 ff.; Latin, 105 ff.; Syriac, 108; Egyptian, 108 f.; Gothic, 109; Armenian, 109; Ethiopic, 109 f.; Georgian, 110; Arabic, 110.
Egyptian canon, 187; 'symptoms,' 21, 23; versions, 21, 64 ff., 73, 108 f.
Elzevir editions, 96 f.
Enoch, Book of, 204 f.
Ephesians, Epistle to, 153, 166.
Ephraim, 25, 55, 59, 78, 93, 129, 183.
Epiphanius, 77, 79, 136.
Epistles: collections of, 163 ff., 188; order of, 12, 164 f., 188.
Erasmus' editions, 95.
Errors in MSS., 2 ff., 112 ff.
Estienne. *See* Stephanus.
Ethiopic version, 30, 73, 109 f., 145.
Eucherius, 228 f.
European texts, 40 ff., 56, 76.
Eusebius of Caesarea, 11, 22 ff., 79, 84, 122, 134, 136, 186; Eusebian 'canons,' 48 f., 52, 155.
Eusebius of Vercelli, 40 f.
Euthalius (Evagrius), 12, 30.
Evagrius. *See* Euthalius.

Families of MSS., 115 ff.
Fathers, 15 ff., 122.
Faustinus, 191.
Fayyumic version, 65 f., 69.
Fell's edition, 97.
Ferrar group of MSS., 31 f.
Filaster, 191 f.
Firmicus Maternus, 87 *n.*
Freer (Washington) MS., 31, 67 *n.*, 127.

Fretelas, 44, 70.
Fulgentius of Ruspe, 90.

Gabelentz, 109.
Galatians, Epistle to, 153.
Gardthausen, 111.
Gaselee, 109.
Gasquet, 107.
Gelasianum Decretum, so-called, viii, 229 f.
Georgian version, 74, 110.
Glaue, 109.
Glosses, 114.
Gospels, 11, 14, 160 ff.
Gospel of 'Peter,' 167. For others see under names.
Gothic version, 43 f., 69 f., 109.
Greek language, 33 ff.
Gregory of Elvira, 45, 88.
Gregory the Great, 50, 85, 91, 193.
Gregory of Nazianzus, 30, 84, 133.
Gregory of Nyssa, 30, 84, 133.
Griesbach, 100.
Grotius, 203.
Gutenberg, 52, 105 f.
Gwilliam, 108.
Gwynn, 108.

Haplography, 114.
Harclean revision, 61 f., 136.
Harnack, 15, 160.
Harris, 128, 130.
Harwood, 99.
Hebrews, Epistle to the, 12, 14, 153, 177, 183, 190 f.; Gospel according to, 183, 186.
Heer, 128.
Helbing, 142.
Henten, 106.
Hermas, Shepherd of, 22, 76, 166, 176, 180, 183, 186 f.
Hesychius, 21, 133.
Hilary of Poitiers, 78, 87 f., 190 f.
Hill, Hamlyn, 108.
Hippolytus, 34, 82, 137.
Hogg, H. W., 108.
Homoeoarcton, 114.
Homoeoteleuton, 114.
Horner, 108 f.
Hort, 103 ff., 117 ff., 138 ff.
Hoskier, 127 f.

Iberian. *See* Georgian.
Ignatius, 76.
Independent churches, 203 f.
Innocent, Pope, 227.
Irenaeus, 26, 34, 78 ff., 83, 103, 170 ff.
Irish MSS., 38.
Isaac, converted Jew, 88.
Isho'dad of Merv, 78 f.
Isidore, 191.

James, Epistle of, 45 f., 48 ff., 153, 176, 183, 185 f., 188, 191 f.
Jerome, 23, 34, 41, 44, 47, 61, 71, 88 f., 145, 191 f. *See* Vulgate.
John, Acts of, 167.
—— First Epistle of, 153, 185; Second and Third Epistles of, 6, 60 f., 85, 153, 175 f., 183, 185 f., 192.
—— Gospel of, 153.
—— of Damascus, 85.
Jude, Epistle of, 60 f., 85, 153, 176, 183, 185 f., 192.
Julian of Aeclanum, 191.
Junilius, 188.
Justin, 77 ff., 167 f.

Karlstadt, 201 f.

Lachmann, 101.
Lactantius, 87 *n.*
Lagarde, Paul de, 110.
Lake, 127, 130.
Langton, 52.
Laodicea, Council of, 195 f.
'Laodicenes, Epistle to,' 193.
Latin versions, 33 ff., 76 ff., 91, 105 ff., 137.
Latin writers, 85 ff.
Lectionaries, 13.

Leipoldt, 109.
Leontius, 188.
Leucius, 167.
Lewis, A. S., 108, 128.
Loebe, 109.
Lucas of Bruges, 97.
Lucian of Antioch, 124, 133, 185.
Lucifer of Cagliari, 28, 41 f., 44 f., 87 ff., 191 f.
Luke, Gospel of, 7, 153.
Luther, 200 f.

Mace, 99.
Manuscripts, Greek, 11 ff., 16, 19 ff.
Marcion and Marcionite prologues, 12, 52, 59 f., 76 f., 137, 161, 165 f., 184.
Mark, Gospel of, 153.
Martianay, 107.
Matthaei, 100.
Matthew, Gospel of, 153.
Matthias, Gospel of, 186.
Mayser, 142.
Mazarin Bible, 105 f.
Memphitic version. *See* Bohairic.
Methodius, 122.
Mill, 98.
Miller, 102.
Minuscule writing, 5.
Moses Bar Kepha, 79.
Moulton, J. H., 142, 151.
Muratorian Canon, 208 ff.

Nemesianus of Tubunas, 36, 87.
Nestle, 103 *n.*, 104, 106.
Niceta of Remesiana, 42, 44.
Nonconformist churches, 203 f.
Non-Interpolations, Western, 139 ff.
Novatian, 40 f., 87, 177.

Oecolampadius, 202.
Optatus, 192.
Order of Books, 11, 14. *See* Epistles.
Origen, 17 f., 21, 23, 63, 81 ff., 87, 89, 122, 124, 133 ff., 137, 174 ff., 182 f.
Orthography, 141 f.

Pacian, 191.
Palæography, 4.
Palestinian Syriac version, 62 f.
Palimpsest, 25.
Palmer, E., 104.
Palut, 58.
Pamphilus, 23, 30, 84, 134.
Paper, 5, 9.
Papyrus and papyri, 5 ff., 19 f.
Parablepsia, 114.
Paragraph, 7.
Parchment, 5. *See* Vellum.
Patrick, 90.
Paul (*see* Epistles): Acts of, 181, 186.
Paulinus of Nola, 191.
Pelagius, 51, 89 ff., 191 f.
Peshitta revision, 56, 58 f., 60 ff., 74, 136.
Peter, Acts of, 167; Apocalypse of, 180 f., 186; First Epistle of, 153, 185; Second Epistle of, 39, 60 f., 85, 153, 176, 183, 185 f., 192; Gospel of, 167, 186.
Peter of Laodicea, 63.
Philemon, Epistle to, 6, 72, 153, 184.
Philippians, Epistle to, 153.
Philoxenian Syriac version, 61, 108, 128, 137, 185, 188.
Photography, 4.
Pius x., 52.
Platt, 110.
Polycarp, 76, 79.
Polyglot, Complutensian, 94 f., London, 97.
Prefaces, 11.
Presbyterian churches, 203 f.
Primasius, 39, 51, 88, 90; so-called (=Cassiodorus), 3, 90 f. *See* Cassiodorus.
Principles of Criticism, 111 ff.
Priscillian, 46 f., 52, 88, 155, 191 f.
Promissionibus, Auctor de, 38.
Psalms 'of Solomon,' 24.
Pseudo-Clement, 181.
Purple MSS., 9, 30 f., 133 f.
Pusey, P. E., 108.

QUATERNION, 8.
Quotations. *See* Citations.

RABBULA, 60, 185.
Radermacher, 142.
Reformation, the, and the Canon, 198 ff.
Roman canon, a, 223 ff.
Romans, Epistle to the, 34, 153, 163.
Rufinus, 82 *n.*, 190.

SABATIER, 107.
Sahidic version, 21, 30, 65 ff., 136, 145, 187 *n.*
Sanday, 105, 107, 130, 153.
Sayings of Jesus, 151.
Schaaf, 108.
Schmiedel, 141.
Scholz, 100.
Scribes, 9.
'Scripture,' 158.
Scrivener, 102.
Sense-lines, 14.
Septuagint, 65, 71, 150 f.
Serapion (of Antioch), 58.
Sheets, 8.
Simon, 97.
Sixtus v., 52, 106.
Sixtus Senensis, 200.
Skeat, 109.
Soden, Hermann von, 105, 117 f., 130 ff., 142, 144 f.
Souter, 105.
'Spanish' texts, 45 f.
Speculum, 46, 191 ff.
Stephanus: Greek editions, 96; Latin editions, 106.
Streitberg, 109.
Sunnias, 44.
Swete, 129.
Synoptic tradition, 153.
Syriac canon, 226.
Syriac versions, 54 ff., 108; Old-Syriac version, 56 ff., 71 ff., 76 ff., 92, 127, 141, 177.
Syrian readings, 118 ff.

TATIAN. *See* Diatessaron.
Tertullian, 35, 39, 77, 86 f., 157, 173 f., 192.
'Testament,' 156 f.
Textual criticism, 3 f., 111 ff.
Thackeray, F. St. J., 142.
Thebaic version. *See* Sahidic.
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 78, 118, 187 f., 232.
Theodoret of Cyrus, 85, 136.
Theodulf of Orléans, 51.
Thessalonians, Epistles to, 14, 153; Second Epistle to, 12.
Thomas, Gospel of, 186.
Timothy, Epistles to, 153.
Tindale, 71.
Tischendorf, 102.
Titus, Epistle to, 153.
Translations, 10, 13 ff., 16, 33 ff., 75; of patristic works, 17 f.
Tregelles, 102.
Trent, Council of, 197, 236 f.
Turner, 130.
Tyconius, 39, 90.

ULFILAS, 69, 145.
Uncial writing, 5, 7.

VALLA, Laurentius, 95.
Vellum and Vellum MSS., 5, 8, 20 ff., 25. *See* Parchment.
Versions. *See* Translations.
Victorinus, Marius (Afer), 137 *n.*, 191.
Victorinus of Pettau, 90.
Vulgate, 41 f., 44, 47 ff., 77, 81, 88, 91, 105 ff. *See* Jerome.

WALKER, John, 99.
Walton. *See* Polyglot.
Weinberger, 111.
Weiss, B., 103 *n.*, 127 f.
Westcott, 103 ff., 117 ff., 138 ff.
Western texts, 118 ff.
Westminster Confession, 203.
Wettstein, 99.
Weymouth, 104.

White, H. J., 106 f., 128, 145.
White, Joseph, 108.
Widmanstadt, 108.
Winstedt, 129.
Wordsworth, John, 106 f., 128, 145.
Writing, styles of, 5 ff.
Wycliffe, 71.

Zeno of Verona, 87 n.
Zohrab, 109.
Zwingli, 202.